

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 18 DECEMBER 1884**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 18 December, 1884.

Question.—Supplementary Estimates, 1884-5, No. 1.—  
Supply—Loan Estimates.—Free Conference.—  
Message from the Legislative Council.—Suspension  
of Standing Orders.—Supply—Loan Estimates.—  
Crown Lands Bill.—message from the Council.—  
Adjournment.

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

### QUESTION.

Mr. NORTON asked the Colonial Secretary—

1. Have the Government received confirmation of the reported murder of blacks near Irvingbank, in the Herberton district?

If so, do the Government propose to institute any criminal proceedings in connection with that alleged gross outrage?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. W. Griffith) replied—

1. The Government have received the evidence taken at an inquiry held into the reported murder referred to, from which it appears that a murder was, in fact, committed. The evidence is, however, incomplete and unsatisfactory, and further inquiries are being made into the matter.

2. I trust hon. gentlemen will excuse me from at present answering the second question.

### SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1884-5, No. 1.

The PREMIER (Hon. S. W. Griffith) presented, by command, a message from His Excellency the Governor.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received a message from His Excellency the Governor, forwarding, in accordance with the provisions of the 18th section of the Constitution Act of 1867, Supplementary Estimates No. 1, for the year 1884-5.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson) moved that the Estimates be printed and referred to a Committee of Supply.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Mr. Speaker,—I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if this is a new system of messages coming down from His Excellency. I have

never seen any reason why a Minister should not hand in a message from the Governor at any time, and I have never seen the use of an official coming down here in a certain dress and often interrupting the proceedings of this House to deliver messages from His Excellency. It is a form of procedure that is quite unnecessary, and I have often wished the mode adopted on the present occasion could be followed; but there were official difficulties in the way of bringing down messages in that manner. Now, however, we have had one introduced in that way, and it has got to its destination in perfect safety in the same way as if it were sent down by the official messenger. I should like to know whether this is only a temporary expedient while the Governor is away, or whether it is to form a precedent for the future. I think it would be a much cheaper way of delivering messages; it is certainly much more business-like and effective. Has the Premier come to the conclusion that this is the style in which messages should be delivered to the Speaker from His Excellency?

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—I am surprised at the want of knowledge of parliamentary practice exhibited by the hon. member. If he will look at "May," on messages from the Crown, page 504, he will see that after the Sovereign coming in person to Parliament—

"The mode of communication next in importance is by a written message under the Royal Sign-manual to either House singly, or to both Houses separately. The message is brought by a member of the House, being a Minister of the Crown, or one of the Royal household."

Did not the hon. gentleman know that before?

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Didn't he?

The PREMIER: I apologise for giving the hon. gentleman credit for sincerity in what he stated. I find that in New South Wales it is a very common practice for messages to be handed in by a Minister.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: It is always done there and has been for years.

The PREMIER: It is sometimes done in that way in many places. I cannot understand the hon. gentleman asking the question. I presume messages in future will be communicated in whatever way is most convenient.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: If the hon. gentleman had attended to what I said, and simply answered my question, he would not have made the foolish remarks he did.

Question put and passed.

### SUPPLY—LOAN ESTIMATES.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson), the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into Committee further to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty by way of loan.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that there be granted by way of loan the sum of £48,000, to defray the expense of constructing the Beauraraba Branch line, length sixteen miles.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Miles) said that branch line would connect with the main line of the Southern and Western Railway, about three miles on the Toowoomba side of Cambooya, near the bridge on the main road to Beauraraba. There would be no lands resumed for the line, as it went along the main road all the way, which was five chains wide, and would therefore afford ample room for ordinary wheel traffic and the railway as well. There was a very large population settled in the districts which the railway would traverse, and the line would accommodate the Westbrook Homestead Area selectors, and a

considerable number of selectors on the Eton Vale Homestead Area, as well as a large population settled in the neighbourhood of Beauaraba, North Branch, and Yandilla. There was a large number of selectors located on the original Yandilla Run, and a considerable number on the Condamine, whose trade would go by the Beauaraba Branch Railway. The line being a surface one, would be an easy one to construct; it was badly wanted for the accommodation of a large number of settlers; and so far as branch lines were concerned, none would, he believed, be likely to be more profitable than that one.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he had no intention of opposing that line. It was a very different line from the deviation from Too-woomba to Drayton, about which he would have something to say when they came to it.

Mr. NORTON asked if the Minister for Works could tell the Committee whether the line was to be carried beyond Beauaraba or whether it was to stop there?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he did not know that the line would be extended very much beyond Beauaraba. The hon. member was aware that the country on the Condamine was occupied by a considerable number of agricultural settlers. Those people would be perfectly satisfied to get over their difficulties of carriage by having a line constructed as far as Beauaraba, which line, as he had said, would accommodate the selectors on Eton Vale, Yandilla, North Branch, and Condamine Plains.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN asked whether £48,000 was the Engineer's estimate?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said it was, but he believed the line could be made for a great deal less. There was no land to be resumed and no earthworks or bridges, though there might perhaps be a small culvert or two. He believed the work could be done for £2,000 a mile. At all events, he could assure hon. members that he would keep down the cost as much as possible.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said if such a sum was voted as that, the Engineer might play "ducks and drakes" with it. £3,000 for a surface line! Why, it was ridiculous. The line could be made on the broad gauge for less than £2,000 a mile.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that if the hon. member for Townsville when in office could not keep the Engineer in order, how was it possible for him (Mr. Miles) to do so? He had been astounded at the estimate of the Engineer, because there were no difficult bridges required; but that was the estimate, and he would endeavour to see that economy was exercised.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that the hon. gentleman stated that he was astounded when the sum was mentioned, and that he was perfectly certain the work could be done for less; yet he asked the Committee to vote the amount. The hon. gentleman did not seem to know that it was the Engineer's estimate until he had consulted the Attorney-General. He (Mr. Morehead) did not know whether the Attorney-General was Engineer-in-Chief, but the Minister for Works had certainly consulted him. It would be far better for the hon. gentleman to ask for such a sum as he himself considered was necessary for the work.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said it was the duty of the Minister for Works, having admitted that he thought the amount was too much, to ask for a less sum. The hon. member said the line would not take more than about £30,000, and yet he asked them to vote £48,000, and promised to do the work as cheaply as he could. It was quite

possible that, if a man took office who had a less firm grasp of the Engineer-in-Chief than the hon. gentleman, the Engineer would take it for granted that the £3,000 per mile had to be spent and would spend it. Engineers were guided a great deal by the amount of the vote, especially if a big amount was to be expended. Why not make the vote just about what the hon. gentleman said he wanted—that was about £30,000, or £32,000?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said it was his duty to act on the Engineer's estimate. Although his opinion did not agree with that of the Engineer, he had put down what the Engineer said the cost would be. On the previous night he (the Minister for Works) was found fault with because the estimate of the Engineer was not put down; now he was blamed because he had put the Engineer's estimate down. It was very hard to please hon. members. No matter what he did, they were dissatisfied. All he could say was that every economy would be exercised in the construction of the line.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that it would be far more consistent if the hon. gentleman would ask for a sum which he himself believed would make the line. The hon. gentleman did not believe in the estimate, nor did he (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) believe in it. He would rather believe in the estimate made by the hon. gentleman. It was a surface line, and required no earthworks. How in the name of common sense, therefore, was it going to cost £48,000? There was no doubt that if the money was voted the Engineer would spend it. Once the money was voted for a surveyed line, the hon. gentleman might depend upon it that it was no longer under his control; the Engineer would find ways and means to spend it. He did not see why they should vote such a sum; it would not complete the line, and they would be asked for another vote by-and-by for that purpose. They would be asked for £10,000 or £15,000 to complete the line, and for the permanent-way material.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said they had voted several sums on estimates which the hon. gentleman himself brought down—he did not know how many—but certainly a good many sums to complete lines. He thought it would be far better to know at once what would be the outside cost; and then there would be no more coming down for money to complete the lines. The hon. gentleman had endeavoured to show that he had tried to build low-cost railways. Where were they? Why, on the Loan Estimates sums after sums had been voted to complete lines! He thought hon. members should be bound to some extent by the Engineer's estimate.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he thought the only reason why hon. members objected to the vote was that given by the Minister for Works himself. The hon. gentleman had told them that he believed the estimate was excessive, and he was astounded at it, yet he asked them to vote a sum that he described in such terms. Surely the hon. gentleman could hardly expect them to do that, without they got some better reasons than had been given yet. Perhaps some of the hon. gentleman's colleagues might help him through his trouble.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the amount now asked for was outside the Engineer's estimate for construction, and instead of having a contingent vote to complete the line, the Engineer's estimate made provision for the permanent-way material. The vote—£48,000—would complete the line, and it was far better to have one sum to cover the whole amount.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman was talking utter nonsense. The purchase of the permanent-way material and

every other item was always included in a vote. Not one single vote had passed that House for permanent-way material since the hon. gentleman had been in it. They had always simply voted so much for the line, and the amount was to complete it, including the cost of the permanent way. The Minister for Works on the previous night found that too small an amount had been put down for a line, and he said in his ignorance that the Engineer could not have made any allowance for permanent way. That was simply a guess, and an utterly incorrect one. There had never been a single vote passed for the construction of a railway which did not include permanent way since the colony was a colony.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he gave the information as it had been reported to him. He quoted from a departmental memo. which had been supplied to him, which stated that the total expenditure on the branch lines for which an additional amount was asked—South Brisbane, Sandgate, Brisbane Valley, Fassifern, Highfields, and Killarney—did not cover the cost of permanent-way material, for which transfers had yet to be made, such transfers to be debited to the supplementary amounts now asked for.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he ought to know a good deal more about the matter than the Engineer, because he passed those very votes; and each of them included cost of permanent way. He did not think the Colonial Treasurer understood the memo. he had just read, the meaning of which no doubt was that the Engineer had taken the cost of permanent way from votes for some other lines which must be refunded. If the Engineer meant that the votes for those lines did not include permanent way, he said what was untrue. The statement of the Colonial Treasurer, founded on a chance expression of the Minister for Works last night, was simply nonsense. The hon. gentleman had made a huge blunder, and was seeking to shelter himself behind a memo. which he did not understand, from the Engineer-in-Chief.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he had a distinct recollection that the estimate for the Sandgate Railway—£60,000, with an additional £6,000 for the purchase of land—was to cover everything. The amount voted in the first instance was £52,000, and in the following year £14,000. It certainly included permanent way.

Mr. BLACK said he was under the impression that the railway votes they were now passing did really include the cost of the permanent way, whereas it now appeared that they did nothing of the sort. The cost of permanent way he understood to be about £800 a mile, and if that was not included in the votes they would be asked for an additional 25 per cent. at some future time to complete the lines. If that was the case he would point out to the Committee and to the country the vote of £7,000,000 for railways now asked for really meant £9,000,000, and the total of the proposed loan instead of being £10,000,000 would be £12,000,000—to say nothing of the usual excess of expenditure over estimates which most of the engineers seemed to have drifted into. He was inclined to think the Minister for Works had made a mistake, but in any case the Committee should be told plainly what was the real state of the case. Did the money they were now asked to vote include rails, or did it not?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The sum put down on the Estimates included all material for the construction of the lines.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman told him a short time ago that it did not. Which statement was correct? Probably it would be better to have the Engineer-in-Chief at the bar and examine him on the matter, for the Ministers did not seem to know anything about it.

Mr. JORDAN said he understood the Minister for Works to say that the votes included all material.

Mr. BLACK: The hon. gentleman told us distinctly just now that the reason we were asked for votes to complete railways was because permanent way was not included in the original estimates.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Who said so?

Mr. BLACK: The Minister for Works said so.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I said nothing of the sort.

Mr. BLACK: The Colonial Treasurer said the same thing in reading from a memo. he had received from the Engineer's Department.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: What I said was that the hon. member for Townsville, when Minister for Works, cut down the amount so much that it would not complete the lines, and that in consequence we are now asking for additional sums to complete them. I said nothing about permanent way not being included.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said it was the Colonial Treasurer who stated that permanent way was not included in the original votes, and that they were now asking for supplementary votes to complete the lines in consequence. It was not true.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Engineer-in-Chief might say the same about those votes at some future time, if, after having spent all the money in construction, he had not enough to pay the cost of the permanent way. The Treasurer of that day would receive a memo. similar to the one which the hon. gentleman had just now read from the Engineer-in-Chief. He (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) asserted that all the votes for railways included cost of permanent way.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he was sorry to again have to correct the Minister for Works, because he most distinctly said that the amount was purely for construction, and he emphasised that by using the words he (Mr. Morehead) had quoted. Afterwards, when the hon. gentleman got a hint from his colleagues, he chucked in material, in order to make up weight, as he (Mr. Morehead) supposed. In his first statement the Minister said that the amount was for the construction of the railway, and he said nothing about material.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again at a later hour of the evening.

#### FREE CONFERENCE.

The hour named by the Legislative Council for the Free Conference between the two Houses on the subject of the Crown Lands Bill having arrived, the SPEAKER directed the Clerk to call the names of the managers appointed by the Legislative Assembly; and the managers proceeded to the place appointed.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: When are we to meet again, Mr. Speaker? Are we to keep loafing about the establishment until we hear a bell rung? What notice are we to get that the Conference is concluded?

The SPEAKER said: The rule of Parliament is, that when the managers' names are called they proceed to the place fixed for meeting, and intimate to the other House that they are ready to confer with their managers. Then both Houses suspend their sittings while the representatives of the two Chambers are in conference. Notice will be given to this House when the Conference is concluded by the ringing of the bell for five minutes.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I should like to ask whether members of this House have access to this free conference—if it is free to all members of this House?

The SPEAKER: The difference between an ordinary and free conference is this: when the conference is composed of four or half-a-dozen members of each branch of the Legislature, the members are confined to the discussion of the reasons set forth in the message of disagreement; but in a free conference they are able to offer objections and use persuasions. That is the difference.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I think you misapprehend me, Mr. Speaker. Is the Conference free to all of us, and can we be present at this interesting discussion?

The SPEAKER: No.

The managers for the Assembly having returned,

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I have to report that the managers appointed by this House to attend the Conference with the Legislative Council on the subject of the Crown Lands Bill proceeded, at the hour appointed, to the place appointed, where we met the managers for the Legislative Council. After considerable discussion, in which we found the representatives of that House disposed to deal with the managers of this House in such a spirit as might have been expected on a matter of such public importance, the managers for this House finally took certain steps which I will now report formally. The managers for this House intimated to the managers for the Legislative Council that, on behalf of this House, they—

Insist on their disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments in clause 20.

That is, the amendments providing for reference to arbitration by way of appeal from the board—

Except the omission of the last line thereof, to which they agree. But propose to insert the following new clause to follow clause 20:—

21. Any person aggrieved by a decision of the board, whether on any original hearing or on a rehearing, may within one month after the pronouncing of the decision, or of the refusal of the Governor in Council to remit the matter to the board, as the case may be, appeal from the decision to the Supreme Court, which is hereby authorised to hear and determine such appeal.

The appeal shall be in the nature of a rehearing, and shall be brought, and the proceedings therein shall be had, in such manner as may be prescribed by rules of court.

The appeal shall be heard and determined by a single judge, but the judge shall, if required by either party to the appeal, call in the aid of two assessors specially qualified, and shall hear and determine the matter with the assistance of such assessors.

One assessor shall be nominated by each party, but such nomination shall be subject to the approval of the judge.

Evidence on an appeal to the court may be taken in the same manner as hereinbefore provided in the case of matters heard and determined by the board.

An appeal shall be to the Full Court from any decision of the judge upon a question of law.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Can those be distributed?

The PREMIER: No copies are available now. Also the following new clause to follow clause 110:—

No appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court from a decision of the board determining the amount of compensation payable to a pastoral tenant or a lessee under this part of this Act.

Under that part of the Bill it was already provided to refer the matter to arbitrators under the Public Works Lands Resumption Act. An appeal to the Supreme Court would have been inconsistent. We also intimated on behalf of this House that we were unable to agree to the amendment made by the Legislative Council in clause (f) of subsection 4 of section 56, but we proposed to omit the whole of that subsection; that is, to omit both the maximum and the minimum rent, leaving it exactly the same as in the case of pastoral leases. We also thought it desirable, on behalf of this House, to offer additional reasons to those previously given for disagreeing to the amendments of the Legislative Council in section 71; that is, those making the term of period required for residence to acquire a freehold five years instead of ten. Those reasons are—

Because under the provisions of 55th section it would be impossible for a man to acquire a freehold as soon as he had complied with the conditions entitling him to a lease.

Because it is desired to encourage the acquisition of land for *bona fide* and actual settlement only; and requiring residence for so short a period as five years before acquiring a freehold, in the case of large selections, would not have that effect.

Because it is already in the power of Parliament to reduce the time, if it should be found on experience that ten years is too long a period; but the period once fixed as a condition of the lease cannot afterwards be increased without an unfair violation of vested rights.

We offered no further reasons for disagreeing to the other amendments made by the Legislative Council. I may say that the Conference was characterised on both sides by a desire to come to the best conclusion possible in a matter of such vital importance to the interests of the colony. I have to add that after we had communicated on behalf of this House what I have stated, to the managers of the Legislative Council, we delivered the Bill to them; and I expect we shall shortly receive a message from that House upon the subject.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER reported that he had received a message from the Legislative Council stating that that House had agreed to the plans, sections, and book of reference of the proposed railway from Howard to Bundaberg.

#### SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: The Colonial Secretary has—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order. When the Colonial Treasurer moves me out of the chair, a discussion can then take place in reference to the Conference.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved for leave to give notice for to-morrow that the Standing Orders be suspended.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: What is the object?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I intended to have given notice earlier in the sitting that I intended to move that the Standing Orders be suspended, with a view of receiving resolutions from the Committee of Supply and the Committee of Ways and Means, and allow of the passing of Bills through all their stages in one day.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: What Bills?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: The Appropriation Bill and the Loan Bill. Question put and passed.

#### SUPPLY—LOAN ESTIMATES.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that the Speaker leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the Loan Estimates.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said: Of course the Colonial Secretary, in delivering his version of what took place at the Conference, has only enlightened us to a small extent; he seems to have formally complied with the usual form in these conferences. Can the hon. member tell us when the message will reach us from the other Chamber? The Bill came to us from the other Chamber, and thereupon we invited them to a conference. It follows, from the rules of the Imperial Parliament, that the Bill was then handed back to the other Chamber, and we can do nothing until we receive their message. Has the hon. member any means of knowing when we are likely to get that message; and when we get the message, does he intend to interrupt Supply in order to go on with it?

The PREMIER: I expect we shall receive the message very shortly—it is the usual practice in the Imperial Parliament that the communication is made without any delay. I have every reason to suppose that the views of this House will be accepted by the Legislative Council, and the only motion necessary to be made will be that this House agree with the message. Whether it is taken into consideration to-day or to-morrow does not make the slightest difference. The only thing that occurs to me is that hon. members might like to see the message in print. Although I should like to dispose of it this evening, it will be more convenient, perhaps, to let it be printed, and take it into consideration to-morrow.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: But to-morrow is private members' day.

The PREMIER: There is so little private business on the paper for to-morrow that it may be almost taken as a Government day.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: I only wanted to know what the procedure would be.

The PREMIER: If we do take it to-morrow I shall certainly ask that it take precedence over private business, and I do not think the House will offer any objection.

Question put and passed; the House went into Committee of Supply.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that the sum of £44,000 be granted, by way of loan, for the construction of a railway deviation from Drayton to Toowoomba. The proposed deviation would be eleven or twelve miles in length, and it would effect a saving of between eight and nine miles on the line between Toowoomba and Warwick. The amount asked for was the Engineer's estimate.

Mr. NORTON: Is the line surveyed?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Several surveys have been made, and it is very possible there may be another.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the proposed deviation was a very unnecessary expenditure at the present time. The hon. member for Port Curtis asked whether the line had been surveyed. It was one of the first lines surveyed from Toowoomba, and surveys had been made over and over again. The House long ago deliberately came to the conclusion that the most economical plan was to send the line round by Gowrie Junction; and that plan was carried out.

Reasons for the proposed deviation might be given to a certain extent, but while railways were so urgently wanted in many other parts of the colony they ought to be considered first. It was what the Premier described the other night as one of the luxuries of railway travelling; it was simply to effect a saving of eight or nine miles on a main line of railway that they were asked to go into an expensive job of that sort. Their object ought to be to provide railways for the benefit of the producing interests of the colony, and not to furnish the luxuries of railway travelling. The object was to save eight miles on the road to Warwick, and yet the very next item was one of £500,000 to make a direct line to Warwick. The reason given by the hon. member must appear absurd to him. If made, the portion of the line already constructed would be rendered useless—and all that for the purpose of saving twenty minutes' travelling on the route now taken by the main line of railway. The expense of the deviation would be a great deal more than appeared on the estimate. He had no doubt that it was another of those lines put down for the benefit of property holders. What would be the cost of the land to be resumed along the course of the deviation? There was no excuse for the Government not having a proper estimate of the cost of the land to be resumed on any line, and there was much less excuse in connection with the proposed line, because it had been talked about ever since they had railways in Queensland.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the amount put down was for the construction of the line, and did not include compensation for land to be resumed. The object of the line was not so much to shorten the distance to Warwick as to give accommodation to the large number of people settled along the proposed line. There was a great deal of close settlement between Toowoomba and where the deviation would join the main line. Most hon. members knew the reason why the present line was taken round by Gowrie Junction: it was taken round there for the purpose of avoiding settlement. The Government had come to the conclusion that the time had now arrived when justice should be done, and they had framed their railway policy in such a way that it would contribute to the benefit, not of this town or that town, but of the country as a whole. He believed the proposed deviation was one that ought to be constructed.

Mr. ARCHER said if they had more money than they knew what to do with the line might be carried out; but in a new country like this, where none of the public works were completed, it was useless spending money in odd corners here and there. Those things might come in time; but it appeared the Government wished to pass that enormous loan, and had fossicked out all the corners they could find to spend the money upon. They had quite enough works to spend money upon without going to look for places in which to waste their money.

Mr. GROOM said what the leader of the Opposition stated was quite correct. He (Mr. Groom) had given a pledge to his constituents in 1863, when Mr. Macalister introduced his railway policy, that he would support no policy which did not include Drayton in its course, and he adhered to that pledge. A caucus meeting was held by Mr. Macalister and his supporters, at which Mr. Fitzgibbon, the engineer, was present; and he represented to him and the then member for Western Downs, Mr. Taylor, that it would be utterly impossible to take the railway to Drayton from an engineering point of view, because the railway station would have to be on an incline. That was the reason given by the engineer, and why the railway was taken

away where it now was. Mr. Fitzgibbon in those days occupied a peculiar position. He was called engineering surveyor, and the then Premier made a contract with him of £1,500 a mile to survey the line of railway from Ipswich to Warwick, and from there to Dalby, and it was his interest to take the railway as many miles as he possibly could. When they saw the divergence that had been made by the immense curves on the Warwick and Dalby line, they would see that that was accounted for by the engineer wishing to lengthen the line. The survey was taken in 1864, at the time Mr. Fitzgibbon's ability as an engineer began to be doubted. It was taken from Eton Vale Run, and the agricultural settlement of Greenmount; went up Spring Creek, passed through the town of Allora, through the Gladville station, and then into Warwick. That was not 43 miles, as against the 66 miles which Mr. Fitzgibbon surveyed. Unfortunately at that time the country was committed to the arrangement, and he (Mr. Groom) had to be responsible to his constituents for the pledge which he made, and which to all appearances had been broken. He had to encounter a very severe opposition, because he was led to give way to the engineer's opinion that the line from Drayton was utterly impracticable, and could not be carried out. What the hon. member said was perfectly correct—that the survey could have been taken from Drayton as easily as from anywhere else. Of course they were novices in railway construction in those days. In 1862 and 1863, when the railway policy was carried, they had no other engineer than Mr. Fitzgibbon, and they had no one to tell them whether they were right or wrong. In consequence a great many mistakes were made, and especially so on the Ipswich-Toowoomba line. If they travelled by road to the Main Range from Helidon to Toowoomba it was only eleven miles, but by rail it was twenty-six, and when Mr. Coote made his tramway survey, which was largely availed of by Mr. Fitzgibbon, the distance was reduced to thirteen miles. There were engineers in the colony now who could take the line direct in fourteen or fifteen miles, and thus eleven miles would be saved. The member for Mulgrave made a mistake if he thought the railway would benefit private property. There were no property holders to benefit. The survey went through a considerable portion of Crown land—what was known as the Swamp—and the only landed proprietor through whose land the line would go was the Hon. J. Taylor, and his land was purely grass paddocks, and no town allotments whatsoever. The only mistake made by the Minister was when he said the line would save eight miles, because he (Mr. Groom) knew Mr. Cannon's survey—which he made, and which could be found recorded in the "Votes and Proceedings"—saved more than eleven miles. Mr. Cannon estimated the cost at £53,000; but he thought £44,000 was a fair estimate; and, as the Minister for Works had said, there would be more traffic on that line; whereas on the line from Gowrie Junction to the point where it branched off from the Southern and Western Railway there was little or no traffic, because it passed through Gowrie and Westbrook Runs; and, as was known, all the wool from those stations went by way of Oakey Creek. The only traffic was the passenger traffic. The line now proposed would tap a large amount of agricultural settlement, and he looked upon its construction as simply carrying out what ought to have been done in the first instance. There could be no doubt that had the railway gone through the town of Drayton it would have made a wonderful difference in the settlement of the country. It would have tapped agricultural settlement the whole of the way,

whereas the present line was most unproductive. If his memory served him rightly the member for Mulgrave was member of a Government who sanctioned an expenditure of £17,000 or £20,000 for a deviation at Ipswich which saved only three miles, and now that they were asked to spend £44,000 on a deviation, saving nine or ten miles, he objected to it. It was a deviation that would result in much good to the country and would add a very considerable amount of revenue to the Treasury in the course of the year. The wear and tear and the permanent way of the present line were matters which should also be taken into consideration; and, on the whole, he thought that there was ample justification for the construction of the proposed deviation.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said he was not responsible for the Ipswich deviation.

Mr. GROOM: Mr. Walsh was then Minister for Works.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said he had carried out that deviation, but had the work not been half done and the contract let for the remainder, he would have stopped the whole work. The line proposed, he admitted, was an improvement, but it was one of those luxuries that they could not afford at the present time, and he looked upon it as being part of the remarkable payments that were being made to certain members for their adherence to the present Government. When the line was before the House in 1863, the route was of course very much debated, and they had to "cut their coat according to their cloth." They decided that as they would have to go to Dalby they had better go a certain distance that way.

Mr. GROOM: The Dalby line was not thought of in 1863.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said that they were agitating about railways in Dalby in 1861. They knew very well that a railway would go there, and they considered that it was much more economical to make a deviation so as to shorten, as far as possible, the branch to Dalby. The line to Warwick was actually increased; but a large portion of it being a line that must necessarily be a portion of that to Dalby it was an economical line. In addition to that, the line by Drayton presented engineering difficulties which still existed, notwithstanding what was said by the Minister for Works. The opinion was given by good engineers, and the hon. member made a mistake if he thought they had any better engineers now. The hon. member voted for the present line, and the only other member now in the House who voted for it was the hon. member for Darling Downs, the Minister for Works. Those were the two men who now proposed the deviation. They told a story about having been convinced by the engineering ability of the Engineer-in-Chief at that time; but the Committee had nothing to do with that; the fact they had to do with was that the very two men who now proposed the deviation were the only two members now in the House who voted for the line as it at present stood. He did not know where the dense population was which the Minister for Works had referred to; he knew that when he was there last he could drive his buggy about at night without driving against a house. It was not so many years ago since the municipality of Drayton were almost beggars for an amount of £150 to fill up a drain, just outside their municipality, which was destroying some of their land. He was sure that if the line could not be justified on the plea raised by the Colonial Treasurer, that it shortened the route to Warwick, it could not be justified on the plea that it

went through a dense population. The Minister did not seem to have considered another point—that the working of that new line would render unworkable and perfectly useless a great part of the line between Gowrie and the place where the Drayton line joined the Warwick line. By their own assertions there was no population there, and they would be leaving that line unused and making a new one. Surely the colony was not in a position to indulge in such luxuries as that! It was simply a sacrifice to the popularity of the Speaker in the town of Toowoomba and the neighbourhood—spending £44,000 to increase the power of that gentleman and his party. Besides that, £44,000 was not the amount the line was to cost. That was more than £5,000 a mile, but they were told it did not include one penny for compensation; and the compensation to be given was one of the most important factors in moving the men who wanted that line. He had no doubt the line would cost £100,000 before it was done. How could the Ministry justify the line as cutting off part of the main line to Warwick, when they had put down £500,000 for the same purpose in another direction? They were going to shorten that part of the line by five miles; whereas the only reason the Government could give for the next line they had down was that it would shorten the line to Warwick by about fifty miles. As to the settlement to be served by that deviation, it was purely ridiculous. All the dense population referred to by the Minister for Works was not more than four and a-half miles from the line at the present time; and farmers within four and a-half miles from a railway were pretty well off in the present state of the colony. Why should they take a line into every man's barn-yard? It was downright extravagance; and it illustrated what he had said with regard to the Loan Estimate. They were going to vote £10,000,000 because the Government had supporters enough at their backs to carry nearly every vote, yet by their own admission they could not spend that money during their term of office. Even if the present Government lasted till the expiration of the present Parliament, which was not likely, they could not spend more than about £4,000,000 out of the £10,000,000. It was giving them a roving commission; and what lines were they likely to choose? The Speaker's line would come in pretty prominently. Although men outside were thirsting to get a line within 100 miles of them, and men in the farming districts were striving to get a line within twenty miles of them, the farmers who were now within four and a-half miles of railway would be gratified first. There was not the slightest reason for the line; it was worse even than the Ipswich to Warwick line. There would be some justification for that some day, and there might be justification for the extension now under consideration, but it would be at a far later date.

Mr. GROOM said the hon. gentleman was wrong in telling the House that the present Minister for Works voted for the Warwick Railway. The vote was carried by a majority of 15 to 11, and the only member now present who voted for it was himself (Mr. Groom). The Minister for Works was a member of the House at the time, but he did not vote on that occasion; his name did not appear on the division list. But the member for Darling Downs at that time, Mr. John Watts, was opposed to the construction of the line altogether. The hon. gentleman had been pleased to refer to the engineers at that time and now. He (Mr. Groom) was not an engineer, but he knew a little, at all events, about the enormous blunders committed by Mr. Fitzgibbon, the engineer, when they first initiated their railways. There was no doubt that gentleman

had grossly misled the House in reference to the plans and construction of the railway. Mr. Robert Mackenzie—a gentleman who they all knew was not given to make rash statements, but was particularly careful in the choice of his words—said that at the time Mr. Fitzgibbon made his appearance in Queensland he placed before the Government an estimate for the construction of a light railway; and that the line from Ipswich to Toowoomba was to cost £4,000 a mile. But what were the actual results when the line was completed? From Ipswich to Helidon the cost was £10,000 per mile and from Helidon to the top of the Main Range £16,000 per mile. And yet Mr. Macalister assured the House at that time that it would only cost £4,000 a mile. He did not think that they had got any engineers at the present time in the colony who would mislead a Minister to that extent and entail such a loss on the country. The fact was that the railway took a circuitous route—more like the windings of a river than of a railway—through the manœuvring that was resorted to in those days to bring the line to certain places. The hon. gentleman said that his memory carried him back to 1861; if it did, he must know something of the manœuvring there was to get the railway to particular places and to secure stations at special spots. There was not the same gerrymandering in these days as there was in those days; and greater security existed against manœuvring at present than was exercised then. The hon. gentleman did the present engineers a very great injustice. He believed that they had engineers in the colony at the present time—some in the Government Service and some not—who were as competent as any engineers in the world, and who were quite as competent to give an opinion to the House in regard to the construction of railways as the hon. gentleman.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said if the Minister for Works did not vote in that division very likely he went out of the House.

Mr. GROOM said he did not think he was in the House.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that, knowing the man as he did, he believed that if he had been in the House at the time he would have voted against any railway line; for in 1869 he (Sir T. McIlwraith) got up a meeting in Roma for the purpose of securing a railway to that far region, and their first business was to write to Mr. Miles and ask him to assist them. Mr. Miles's answer was that he would rather resign his seat than support such a wild scheme. He would as soon have talked of a service of balloons up to Highfields as of a railway. He had been educated since. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Groom) need not try to confuse the matter by talking of the engineering ability of Mr. Fitzgibbon. He was one of the consenting parties to that line, and voted for it. It was considered at that time the best line. It served all practical purposes. Nobody had complained that they had been twenty minutes longer on the way to Warwick by going round by Gowrie Junction; and it would be absurd to spend £100,000 for the purpose of giving facilities to certain farmers, who at the present time were at a maximum distance of four and a-half miles from a railway station. In the present position of the colony the scheme was not only absurd, but dangerous; for, from the influence which the Speaker had with the Ministry, he had not the slightest doubt that the first line to be made would be that useless one.

Mr. NORTON said they had not been told which route the line was to take. Was it to go along the road from Toowoomba to Drayton? If they were informed of that they might have some idea of the population.



The MINISTER FOR WORKS said it did not go along the road, for that would be impossible on account of the gullies. It took the most easy route, and connected with the main line about three miles to the north of Cambooya.

Mr. NORTON asked, if it did not go by the road, which way did it go?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said it went direct to Toowoomba to within three miles of Cambooya. He did not know all the curves and twists.

Mr. NORTON asked if it went up the swamp? He presumed it went through the township of Drayton.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes; it went up the swamp.

Mr. NORTON said that they knew something now. He could only say that there was not much population there. A few people were about the swamp, but very few about Drayton. He supposed the object of the hon. member, to a certain extent, was to save time in the distance to Warwick. Perhaps the Treasurer could tell them whether the Warwick people were being considered. They could not get any information about any one of those lines. Hon. members opposite did not like to commit themselves, because if they gave a reason it might be shown that the reason was not a good one. He supposed that the Minister for Works was aware that there was an allowance made on all goods carried to Warwick on account of the long way they had to travel *via* Gowrie, about sixteen miles—at least, there used to be such an allowance before the hon. gentleman went into office. As a matter of time, surely it was not of much moment to take three-quarters of an hour or even an hour longer. It was not often that a man's business was so important that he was obliged to consider the matter of an hour in that respect. He did not wish to ask the hon. gentleman any questions which would puzzle him; but really they should have some reasons from one Minister or another—they were all equally responsible, and, therefore, if the Minister for Works would not answer the question, the Treasurer, with his usual suavity, might gratify the wishes of hon. members of the Opposition. He was generally very willing to give information, and so was the Minister for Works, and he did not know why he was not on that matter.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the object of the deviation was not to shorten the distance to Warwick at all, but to shorten the distance for residents of Beauraba, Westbrook Homestead Area, and Eton Vale Homestead Area, where there was a large population. It would shorten their distance by nine miles.

Mr. NORTON asked if it would not be cheaper to make those people the allowance that was allowed to the people of Warwick? That would surely satisfy them. If that would not suit the hon. member it must be because he had some other object in view. He wondered whether the meeting the hon. member attended some time ago had anything to do with it? He hoped the hon. gentleman would say whether the Government intended, after that line was constructed, to take up the rest of the line between the point where it joined the Warwick line and the Gowrie Junction, which would be of no use.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Government have not considered that matter yet.

Mr. NORTON said they were told by some private member last night—the junior member for Maryborough, he thought it was—that that line was to be taken up. That gentleman was perhaps supporting the Government under a

fallacy, and things which he expected to be done would not be done. The hon. Minister for Works would not know how to work that piece of line—he would have to keep special engines and carriages there, and hon. members knew well that there would be a difficulty in regard to it. All those things ought to be considered.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman had told them that he had made no estimate of the cost of the line at all. Surely, after all the years the subject had been under discussion, they should have had some sort of notion as to the cost of the line before it was placed upon the Estimates! The hon. gentleman said there was a dense population on the route proposed, and he supposed he would be frightened of the cost of resuming the land. But the hon. Speaker was on a different tack, and tried to show that it would amount to next to nothing. How could that population be settled chiefly upon Crown land? The hon. gentleman said that it would cost little for the resumption of the land, because the line went chiefly through Crown lands. The only reason for constructing the line was that there was a dense population. It was not usual on the Darling Downs to have a dense population upon Crown land. He had heard the hon. member ranting hundreds of times about the want of density; because there were Crown lands which he did not wish to be Crown lands any more. That was the price the Parliament proposed to pay for the Speaker; was he worth it? He thought he ought to be satisfied with his salary.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. member for Mulgrave had been so much in the habit of buying members that he could not help imputing the same thing to the Government. The present Government did not buy members of Parliament. They framed their policy in the interests of the colony, not favouring this town or that town, or this member or that member. The Government were not in the habit of dealing with members in that sort of way, but did justice to the colony as a whole.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. member had done right; he had done it splendidly and had paid no members after all. He accepted the hon. gentleman's assertion that he had not paid any members; at all events, before twelve months were over, those hon. members would be found among those who had been sold.

Mr. GROOM said he had mentioned "Crown lands" just now, and perhaps he had better explain. The most expensive land that the line would pass through, supposing it to be private property, would be just going out of Toowoomba in a southerly direction. It so happened that that land was in the hands of the corporation; but they had no title-deeds to it. It was simply permanently vested in the hands of the corporation, and although they had legal advice that they were virtually the freeholders of it, the Government, no doubt, could resume it under the Public Works Lands Resumption Act. The corporation would be simply in the position of tenants, and not of freeholders. A considerable portion of the line—in fact, the whole portion through the town of Toowoomba—passed through that land. The hon. member for Mulgrave laid great stress on the word "dense" used by the Minister for Works in reference to the population. Perhaps the Minister was a little wrong in using that word.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Dense for Darling Downs.

Mr. GROOM: He dared say it was as the hon. gentleman said, dense for the Darling Downs. The idea in ancient times was to make that district a vast sheep-walk. He remembered hearing

of an antediluvian squatter saying that the continent of Australia was big enough for two men, but when a third came there were too many. That illustrated the policy of those times. There would be a considerable number of farmers benefited by the proposed deviation. The hon. member for Mulgrave had said that the line was a bribe for him (Mr. Groom). Well, he thought the hon. gentleman went a little too far in making that statement. A deputation waited on the Minister for Works and pointed out the necessity of the deviation and the advantages it would confer on the people, and he (Mr. Groom) simply had the honour to introduce the deputation to the Minister. He also introduced the same deputation to the hon. member for Townsville when he was Minister for Works, and he was sure the member for Mulgrave would not say that that hon. gentleman was in the habit of buying constituents or members. He (Mr. Groom) thought they had a higher opinion of the hon. gentleman than that. The member for Townsville told the deputation that his opinion was in favour of the line, but the railway policy of the Government was completed, and they were therefore too late. The then member for Aubigny (the Hon. P. Perkins) told the member for Townsville that his sympathies were entirely with the deputation, and that a very great injustice had been done to that part of the country when the original surveys were made. When the present Minister for Works came into office the same representations were made to him by a deputation, and the result was the vote on the Loan Estimates. He should be very sorry indeed to think that it was put there as a bribe for him. He would not ask the Government to do such a thing, and he was sure the Government would not be corrupt enough to do it. Whether he was worth £50,000 or not he did not care. His object was to have justice done to his constituents. Unfortunately in the early days they did not get justice. They were punished by previous Governments for returning a certain member to that House, and now the time was come for justice to be done they were told that it was a political bribe. He regretted that the hon. member for Mulgrave should use such intemperate language.

THE HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that of course the hon. gentleman did not think that he accused him personally in making the remarks he did. What he said was that that railway was a bribe to the hon. member as member for Toowoomba, and that was what he said again. If the hon. gentleman took it that he (Sir T. McIlwraith) said the hon. member was bribed, that was not what he meant. He was speaking politically, and did not withdraw a single fraction of what he had said. What he had stated was practically the case, although the hon. member tried to get out of it by saying that it was a deputation that got the vote on the Loan Estimates. The deputation was simply a part of the machinery the hon. gentleman employed. The Minister for Works was too old to be caught in that sort of way. The member for Toowoomba got the deputation to come down to Brisbane and wait on the Minister. That was part of the machinery. Of course the hon. member would accept his statement that he was not speaking personally or charging him with personal corruption.

MR. GROOM: Hear, hear!

THE HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Such was not his intention. As to the hon. gentleman's remarks about the old squatters on the Darling Downs, that was a bit of a speech he used to deliver, but which was now out of fashion. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) would like to tell him

that if one man in the community had done more than any other man in making the Darling Downs a sheepwalk it was the present member for Toowoomba, the Speaker of that House. If it had not been for his extraordinary manoeuvring for free selection they would have had a far denser population on the Darling Downs than there was at the present time. The state of affairs existing now was very much brought about by the machinations of the hon. member, and the peculiar style of politics adopted by him and the party of which he was a prominent member. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) liked the simplicity of the hon. gentleman when he tried to show that Crown lands and municipal lands were the same. The hon. member first told the Committee that the line would pass through Crown lands, and afterwards rose up and said he had made a little mistake—that what he referred to were municipal lands like the land for which the Minister for Works had paid £3,000 when he resumed it for railway purposes. Still, notwithstanding that the Government had to pay that considerable sum for a piece of land it was found necessary to resume the hon. gentleman referred to municipal lands as lands which would cost the Government nothing to resume. Could anything be more absurd? Municipal lands were the most expensive lands the Ministry could take a railway through. When a line was carried through such land jobbery began; and the Government had to buy the property at a bigger price than they would have to pay if it belonged to a private individual, as they had to do the other day at Toowoomba.

MR. ALAND said they had had that bargain between the Minister for Works and the corporation of Toowoomba spoken of more than once in that House.

MR. NORTON: Since you delivered yourself to the Philistines.

MR. ALAND said it had been stated that the corporation got more than they were entitled to, and that the Government had made a very bad bargain indeed in giving them £3,000 for the land resumed. That was not the case. The hon. member for Mulgrave had said that the money was paid for a very small portion of the reserve. Well, granting that, he would tell the hon. gentleman that it was the most valuable part that was resumed, and that if it was put in the market it would realise a considerable sum—at least double the amount paid for it by the Government. It had a frontage to Ruthven street, he thought, of 320 feet, which was worth from £12 to £13 per foot. Hon. members could make a calculation and see what the land would fetch at that price. But it had also a frontage to Russell street of 118 feet, for which, he believed, the Government had had an offer of something like £8 to £10 per foot. He would therefore like to know in what way the Government paid the corporation more than they were entitled to. The corporation had made nothing out of the bargain, for they had spent an immense amount of money in draining the land. He believed, if the whole thing were reckoned up, and a debit and credit balance struck, it would be found that the corporation were very little in pocket indeed in accepting the sum of £3,000. But the corporation were actuated by these motives:—They knew that an extension of the railway goods sheds and the station-house was absolutely necessary, therefore they wished to be as lenient as they possibly could with the Government. Hon. members might laugh, but he could assure them that that was the advice he gave to the council, and the council received that advice and acted in a very open straightforward manner. He spoke to his colleague, Mr. Groom, and they agreed that they should charge

the Government as little as possible; indeed, he (Mr. Aland), as a private individual, was willing to give a great deal more for the property than the corporation received. He was surprised that the hon. member for Townsville did not advocate that extension, because he knew the hon. gentleman's heart and his judgment were with those who supported it. The matter of compensation to the owners of the land had been spoken of. He knew the proposed route pretty well, and he believed the corporation would want very little indeed for the land.

Mr. NORTON: Very little!

Mr. ALAND: That part of the reserve was not worth much. The land ran on the margin of a swamp, and after that it got into Taylor's paddock, which certainly was not worth much.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Taylor will see about that.

Mr. ALAND: Mr. Taylor had done very well out of railway reserves. Thank goodness, the time had gone by when Mr. Taylor, or any other man, could make as much in that way again. The railway terminus had no business to be where it was, and would not have been had things been done properly. Well, after leaving Taylor's paddock the line would get into Drayton. The portion of Drayton that it went through was not very valuable. Then it made its way along the public road, and found its way to Beauaraba. He must refer to the remark that had been made by the hon. member for Mulgrave in reference to a sort of payment for services rendered by the constituency of Drayton and Toowoomba. If the hon. gentleman accused his (Mr. Aland's) colleague, Mr. Groom, in that way, he took it that he also accused him (Mr. Aland); and he denied the accusation. He did not think the Government would reward his services in any way. He believed there was a necessity for the line, and he was sure the majority would also see its necessity.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that, instead of calling it a bribe, perhaps it ought to be called a solatium for the Ipswich and Warwick line. Talking about the density of population, could the hon. member say how many mayors there were in Drayton now?

Mr. ALAND said that Drayton was in the Gowrie Division now. There was only one mayor there now.

Mr. GROOM said he would like to say something about the reserve, because there appeared to be a misunderstanding about it, particularly on the part of the hon. member for Port Curtis.

Mr. NORTON: I understand it.

Mr. GROOM: He would state the actual facts of the case. Application was made by him in 1867 for a sum of £8,000 to drain the swamp. It was refused by the House on the ground that if there was a sufficient area of land—he thought there were about twenty-four or twenty-five acres altogether—and if it was valuable, the Government had no objection to lend the corporation the money required for drainage, and they would permanently vest the land in the corporation. The corporation agreed to that. He was not quite sure whether his friend, Mr. Aland, was not mayor of Toowoomba when the arrangement was carried out. As to the part which was reserved the other day, and which hon. members made such anxious inquiries about, he received a letter from the Lands Department stating that the Government intended to resume that portion of the swamp extending from Russell street to Ruthven street, and asking him to furnish the Government with an account of the amount expended on it. He instructed the town clerk at once to examine

the books. The swamp had been let in sections, and Mr. Thorneloe Smith carried out the work so satisfactorily to the Government and the corporation, and did it so systematically and methodically, that there was no difficulty whatever in arriving at the amount that had been spent.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Is that the reason why the Government sacked him?

Mr. GROOM said he knew nothing of that. All he knew was that Mr. Smith did his work in a satisfactory manner. On that particular part that the Government had resumed and put the railway workshops on, the corporation had spent £1,700, and they had also let a portion which returned a rent of £333 a year. They took counsel's opinion as to the right of the Government to resume the land after permanently vesting it in the hands of the corporation, and they got an elaborate opinion in which they were told that they were entitled to compensation for the surrender of the land. The Government had not only got the land on which the workshops and goods sheds were erected, but they had land in Ruthven street which, if sold to-morrow, would realise £10 to £12 a foot, and return a revenue of something like £3,000 or £4,000. They had also the Russell street property, which would bring in something like £1,500 more; so that the Government had property worth about £6,000, and they gave the corporation £3,000. The hon. member for Port Curtis said that was a railway reserve.

Mr. NORTON: Yes, it was.

Mr. GROOM: It was nothing of the kind; and he could produce the *Government Gazette* showing that that particular reserve was vested in the corporation. The notice was signed by Mr. T. B. Stephens, and the land was reserved under the Crown Lands Act of 1863. All the land was private property purchased by Mr. Taylor. There never was a railway reserve there at all; it was all purchased land. As to the railway station, everybody was surprised at where it was put; it ought never to have been put where it was at all. The hon. member therefore was entirely wrong. The bargain had been a very good one to the Government and certainly not a profitable one to the corporation. The Government had deprived them of a splendid reserve. It was a great benefit to them and a loss to the corporation.

Mr. HORWITZ said it was his intention to oppose the line, on the ground that it was wholly unnecessary. The people of Warwick did not want the assistance of Toowoomba to shorten the distance between Warwick and Brisbane by eight miles, and if they could not get a direct line they were quite satisfied with the one they had. It seemed the line would go through the Hon. James Taylor's land. Before the railway was made Mr. Taylor's swamp land was not worth more than £5 an acre, and now they were informed that he got at the rate of £6,000 an acre for it, or a total of between £50,000 and £60,000. He did not believe anybody knew how much Mr. Taylor did get. He was not surprised that the people of Toowoomba were in favour of the deviation, when a great deal of the property through which it ran was freehold. If Mr. Taylor could get at the rate of £6,000 an acre for his land twenty years ago, what could he get for it now? It must be worth five or six times as much; and there was no saying how much they would have to pay Mr. Taylor now for resumption of his land. The proposal involved a real waste of money, and he intended to oppose it.

Mr. NORTON said the hon. member for Toowoomba asserted that the land had never been a railway reserve. He did not pretend to

know anything about it of his own knowledge, but it was one of the legends of the Railway Department that that land had been resumed for railway purposes, and that in some weak moment it was handed over to the Toowoomba Corporation.

Mr. GROOM : That is not correct.

Mr. NORTON said he was willing to admit that the hon. gentleman was right, as he must know more about the matter from his own personal knowledge than he (Mr. Norton) possibly could. The hon. member seemed to take great credit to the people of Toowoomba, because they had gone to so much expense in making a drain. If that drain had not been made half the people would not be there; they could not have lived there—they would have died of fever. It was no great credit to the municipality, therefore, that they made a drain to save their own lives. That was a matter which might be put on one side. The hon. member (Mr. Aland) said the corporation would have got so much more money if they had cut up the land and sold it. They had not the power to cut it up, and it was doubtful whether the House would ever have sanctioned such a scheme. But they certainly gained indirectly, because as soon as it was known that the Government intended to put up a railway station all the land in the neighbourhood went up in value, with the result of a large increase in the rates payable to the corporation. Look at the sale of land which took place immediately opposite; nobody was more surprised than the owner, Mr. Grimes, at the extraordinary price realised. As to the buildings resumed on a portion of the land by the Government, he did not know why they wanted them. They might have left them in the hands of the corporation.

Mr. GROOM : No buildings were resumed.

Mr. NORTON : But the land had buildings upon it, and that was the same thing.

Mr. GROOM : They have a fourteen years' lease of it, with a right of renewal for fourteen years more, at a very high rental.

Mr. NORTON said the buildings need not have been interfered with, and that portion of the reserve could have been left in the hands of the corporation. But no doubt the corporation preferred getting a lump sum to drawing rent for several years. He did not mean to say that the corporation did not wish to put every advantage in the way of the Government. It was natural they should do so, because they could see the enormous advantage to the town to have the place improved by the erection of those buildings, to say nothing of having such an enormous sum of money spent in the place. All those things must be taken into consideration, because they had a direct bearing on the question. Since the discussion began they had managed to get something out of the Minister for Works as to the route, more from the Speaker, and still more from the hon. member (Mr. Aland). If they could only get the hon. member (Mr. J. Campbell) up, still further information might be elicited.

The PREMIER : No : let us go to work.

Mr. NORTON : It was advisable that the Committee should know as much as possible of the route that line was to take. He knew the Premier wanted to get on. He did not care whether they knew anything or nothing. No matter what was asked for, he expected them to sit there like dumb dogs.

The PREMIER : You don't.

Mr. NORTON said he did not intend to do, and it was not the slightest use the Premier objecting, as he should ask any question he cared to ask. He did not ask any questions for the purpose of

delaying the business, but he thought the Committee were entitled to have information, and members would fail in their duty if they did not endeavour to get as much as they could.

Mr. BLACK said he thought the Committee should congratulate itself on the fact that the senior member for Toowoomba was also Speaker, because he was not often able to speak. The hon. member had entered into a matter that evening which had led to a discussion of an hour's duration on a subject utterly irrelevant to the particular railway that should be discussed. They had had introduced to them all the Little Pedlington affairs of Toowoomba and Drayton—the town clerk, the mayor, the city council and swamps, and various other things for which they had no interest; and that had been done, he believed, for the purpose of diverting discussion from the real question—whether that expenditure of £44,000 was justifiable.

Mr. ARCHER : It will be £80,000.

Mr. BLACK said he had no doubt of it, and he thought that was one of the lines for which the least justification could be shown. He did not know a worse one. It was a line not necessitated by any large amount of population or produce, and what the Government could mean by putting it on the Estimates he did not know. It had been suggested that it was a sop to the people of Toowoomba, and he had no doubt it was. They were told on the one hand, "Now you are going to lose the direct traffic with Warwick; you will also lose at no distant date all the intercolonial trade on the New South Wales line; but, on the contrary, we will give you as a set-off an expenditure which will run into £100,000. That was what was at the bottom of the whole thing. It was a fight between Warwick and Toowoomba; and Toowoomba, instead of being one of the leading inland towns, would rank as a third or fourth rate town by the time the railway was made. The whole of the Loan Estimates were bristling with branch lines for the southern portion of the colony, but there was nothing for the Wide Bay district and nothing for the Central and Northern districts, which he ventured to say possessed as good agricultural land as there was in the colony. Round about Brisbane and the Darling Downs there was going to be no less than £3,000,000 frittered away on unnecessary lines, and no justification was shown for the expenditure. He hoped the Government would meet with the reward they deserved. The loan was not floated yet, and it depended much upon its success as to what constituencies would be favoured. He ventured to say that retribution would come on the heads of the Government in three years' time if they were in office, when they had a lot of hungry and clamouring supporters behind them. Then they would see a Treasury not over flush with money, an unsuccessful loan, and supporters asking for the works which had been voted by Parliament. The Government could have adopted much better lines than that Drayton line. What about that abortion of a line at Laidley that they had voted last night. They had no more justification for voting that than they had for sanctioning the present line. The agricultural population settled in the district had every reasonable facility they could expect for a few years, and he looked upon the proposed line as one of the Government jobs. He supposed the question would come to a division, and all the other items would be carried; but let not hon. members suppose that they would get their railways all at once. The questions would have to be fought out again when the plans were submitted, and they would then see which were the favoured districts.

Hon. members must not for one moment think that that night was going to settle whether they were going to get a railway or not. He could pick out which lines he thought were likely to be made, and it was very easy to pick out those not likely to be constructed for another four or five years at the very least.

Question put, and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 20.

Messrs. Miles, Dickson, Dutton, Sheridan, Griffith, Rutledge, Groom, Aland, Smyth, J. Campbell, Jordan, White, Buckland, Foxton, Annear, Beattie, Salkeld, Macdonald-Paterson, Macfarlane, and Isambert.

NOES, 14.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Archer, Norton, Stevenson, Nelson, Lalor, Foote, Chubb, Donaldson, Scott, Horwitz, Palmer, Ferguson, and Black.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The COLONIAL TREASURER, in moving that a sum of £65,000 be granted by way of loan for the completion of the line from Warwick to Killarney, said he did not think it was necessary to say anything about the line.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER, in moving that a sum of £500,000 be granted, by way of loan, for the line from Ipswich to Warwick on account, said it was a line which he believed hon. members would admit was very urgently required. That line, and the succeeding one from Warwick towards St. George, were absolutely necessary if they were to keep the trade of the colony within their own boundary and protect their revenue along the southern and south-western border, which would otherwise be tapped by the approach from New South Wales and South Australia of their lines of railway. Apart from that he was sure his hon. colleague would be able to explain the advantage which would accrue from the opening up of a very large and valuable extent of country for close settlement. He hoped the Committee would sanction those lines, as they formed a most important and necessary part of the national system of railways which they desired to see extended so as not only to encourage settlement in the interior, but also to keep the trade of the colony within its own territorial limits. The line proposed was estimated to save fifty-four miles in the distance between Brisbane and Warwick as against the line at present open *via* Toowoomba, and it would also open up a very large and fertile district for settlement.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he looked upon that railway as a national work. The time was fast approaching when the present line would require to be doubled, and the line now proposed would suit all the purposes of a duplicate line, and carry the whole trade of the southern portion of the colony. He believed that when the hon. member for Townsville was the Minister for Works he authorised a survey of the line, and the survey party was kept on it for a considerable time, with the exception of some intermissions when they were required on other pressing work. Several trial surveys had been made, and hon. members would admit that as the line went over a mountain, every endeavour should be made to find the best route. If they were to get any benefit from their connection with New South Wales, they must have the line as direct as possible. That would be accomplished by the line now proposed. It was not yet finally decided whether it would branch off the Fassifern line, or branch off the Rosewood line and run up the valley of the Bremer. He did not know what the opinion of the hon. member for Mulgrave might be now, but on a previous occasion he pronounced it indispensable. He saw the hon. member shaking his head, but he would read what he said on that

occasion. The matter was brought before the House by the then hon. member for Darling Downs (Mr. Allan), who made a speech on the benefits the country would derive from the line. The hon. member for Mulgrave, referring to the line said—

“With regard to the motion before the House, he firmly believed that the Fassifern line would be, before many years, the main line to Sydney, and he should like to see all the railway work undertaken by the Government tending in that direction. It had been said by hon. members opposite that the Fassifern line was not a good one. The Government never claimed that it was; but they had thought it wiser to go in for a cheap railway at the time, and one which could be easily improved. The Fassifern line would be easy to improve, and he had little doubt that much greater alterations would be required than hon. members might think. There was no doubt that part of the main road to Sydney would be along it, and it would consequently have to be the best line in the colony. The Government had done well in making that line fit merely for the traffic of the present time. The hon. member for Darling Downs (Mr. Miles) had charged the Minister for Works with trying to divert the line as proposed from a particular point—namely, Emu Vale. Now the Minister for Works approved of the motion under debate, and so did he (Mr. McIlwraith), but that approval of the motion did not amount to their believing that a line should go to Harrisville and Emu Vale. Whether it went to Emu Vale, or to Warwick, or to Killarney, depended on the result of the survey. They did not commit themselves to any of those places. Viewing the line in the important light he did, he believed their grand aim should be to make it a good main line, and the shortest route to the colony of New South Wales.”

Hon. members knew that the proposed line would shorten the distance from Ipswich to Warwick by fifty-five miles. In his opinion it was very desirable that that line should be made with as little delay as possible, because the time was fast approaching when the line would require to be doubled. That would suit the purpose of a double line, and therefore it was absolutely necessary to be undertaken. He trusted hon. members would see the necessity of it as he believed it was one of the most important works which the colony could undertake.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the Minister for Works had tried to found an argument for the construction of that line by quoting his adherence to the Emu Vale and Harrisville Railway. He had advocated and carried out the line from Ipswich to Fassifern, and among the reasons for that line, he alleged, was his belief that a line there was in the direction of what he conceived would ultimately be the main route to Sydney. He had intended to creep on and make the line as they found it convenient. And he had followed out in every particular the argument he then used, in passing the vote the other night for the Fassifern Branch extension. He had said, “Extend that line on, and you will find that that will be actually some day the main line to Sydney.” He did not advocate a line from Ipswich to Warwick. He advocated a line through the Main Range so as to get the nearest route to Sydney. But that was a very different proposition from the line under discussion. The Treasurer had said that their border trade was important and that they would lose that trade if they did not look sharp and get railway communication out there. But how did he propose to accomplish that? By commencing at the beginning made about twenty years ago, crossing the Main Range at a much more difficult point; and having done that, in the course of five or ten years they might tap that important trade. Let the hon. members look at the map, and they would see the utter nonsense of the argument. Now, if the trade was of great importance, time was a great element in that importance. To commence at Ipswich, crawl up the Main Range, and run out to St. George did not actually make the route shorter at all. What

was wanted was to strike off from the blue line either at Roma, at Yeulba, at Dalby, or at Beauraba, and they would get the trade in eighteen months. It was said that the line from Ipswich to Warwick would cost £500,000. £500,000 would not look at it. It would cost a million and a-half to take the line up there.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Nonsense !

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH : The hon. member said "Nonsense," but if he had wanted the Committee to have another opinion, why did he not give them estimates of what the line would be? He (Sir T. McIlwraith) said it would cost a million and a-half to make that line from Ipswich to Warwick, as designed at the present time. And in the meantime, how were they to get the trade? The hon. member said "Commence at the wrong end; commence by making the line from Warwick, and run it down by the Main Range, and by the old road till we make this line." That was only a quibble to get out of the argument that they must spend five or ten years and a million and a-half before they could get that road at all. What they wanted to do was to tap the existing line at Dalby, where the country was level, or at all events favourable, and carry it down the Moonie to St. George. That line could be constructed in eighteen months at an expenditure of £200,000 instead of spending £750,000 in eight years to tap the same trade. A more absurd proposal than the last he never heard.

Mr. ARCHER asked how the hon. gentleman had arrived at the cost of the line from Ipswich to Warwick? The Treasurer said, in his Estimates, that the sum asked was on account.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he could not give the hon. gentleman the exact amount. It would be very costly getting over the Range; that was not disputed. But the necessity of the work justified the expenditure. It was all very well for the hon. member for Mulgrave to go about with his finger on the map, pointing to it and saying, "Start from here and from here." But the people of Goondiwindi were entitled to some consideration. Dalby had a railway already, and so had Yeulba. The policy of the Government was to lay down lines for the benefit of the colony, and not for the benefit of every pokey little town that wanted a railway. He thought that the hon. member for Toowoomba would oppose the line. He had got his pet line, and he could assure him that it was not given to him, but simply in the interests of the colony.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH : Especially Carpentaria.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he maintained that anyone looking at the map would see where the lines were to be laid down, and that it was a grand railway policy. There was no "gerrymandering" about the country. It was a national work. He hoped the hon. member for Port Curtis would study the map, as he would be doing something serviceable.

Mr. NORTON : I am looking at it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he was fully convinced that of all the lines proposed, that under discussion would be carried out. They could not afford to go "gerrymandering" for the purpose of accommodating people in all kinds of places. He was perfectly satisfied that that line was one that should be undertaken in the interests of the colony. Even the hon. member for Mackay must agree to it.

Mr. BLACK : I will tell you by-and-by.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that if the hon. member did not, he would make a great mistake.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that when the hon. Minister for Works got eloquent it was a bad case. He said it was a national line. Why was it? If it was because the nation paid for it they were all national lines. He also said that the policy of the Government was not to send a railway from one pokey town to another pokey town. Was Ipswich a pokey town? He did not advocate going from any town at all. His argument was that the trade the line was intended to serve was on the southern and western border. They had already a railway about 300 miles in that direction, and if they wanted to get that trade they ought to get it in the quickest and most economical way. He did not want to start from any pokey town; but he had mentioned that it might start from Roma, Yeulba, Dalby, or Beauraba, and in the course of eighteen months and at the expenditure of about one-fifth of what was proposed here, the hon. gentleman could send a railway down into that district. Why should they climb the Main Range again? He would like to have that answered, and he would like to know also if there had been any survey made as yet?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS : Yes.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked if that survey showed that, with moderate tunnels, moderate cuttings, and with moderate gradients, not exceeding 1 in 50, that line could be made at the price put down?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said all those things could be accomplished. The hon. gentleman was annoyed because he had not an opportunity of proposing the line himself.

Mr. NORTON said the Minister for Works had told him to look at the map and try to make himself useful. He had done so, and saw that there was an awful amount of "gerrymandering" in it. The hon. member had given two reasons for his proposal; his first was that the line would gather in the trade which was going to New South Wales, and the second was that it would shorten the route to Sydney. The leader of the Opposition had showed how that western trade was to be procured much more quickly and at much less expenditure. If the hon. Minister for Works would look at his own map he would see a tracing that would shorten the distance from here to Tenterfield by nine or ten miles less than the proposed line to Warwick. If hon. members looked at that map with the idea of finding anything like a direct line to Warwick, they would be vastly deceived. He would like to ask the hon. member if he had any estimate of the cost of the part of that line over the Range? He had heard there was about twenty miles of very heavy line, and he would ask if the hon. gentleman had any estimate of the cost of that section? There was one thing which struck him when the Treasurer moved the motion, and that was, that he varied it so as to say "on account." Those two words did not appear on the estimate. They all knew that if the line were to be carried out £500,000 would not be nearly enough. The estimate for that twenty or twenty-five miles on the Range was £25,000 per mile, and there was the £500,000 gone straight away. The hon. member must know that that estimate was in the office; he saw it long ago. The hon. gentleman did not like to "let the cat out of the bag." He wanted the Committee to be committed to the proposal, and then the Treasurer would come down again with another vote on account, and there would be a third and a fourth before the line was completed. Then the Committee would know what the whole cost would have been. The £500,000 was a mere flea-bite to what it would cost. He did not want to

ridicule the idea of a straight line to Warwick. He remembered meeting a deputation on the subject some time ago, and they wanted him to consent to the line; but they did not get a promise to that effect. He told them that he thought the present line was sufficient to carry all the traffic, and when the line required duplication, which he trusted it would, there would be reason for them to consider that line. He believed that before that time came a better route would be found; and the mere fact of that other line being marked down to Tenterfield, and giving an easy pull up the Range, seemed to justify that belief. If the direct line to Tenterfield he had referred to were adopted, Warwick could be reached in a much easier way than by the plan now proposed by the Government, and would only involve an additional distance of fifteen miles. It would also save the twenty miles up the Range, where there would be steep gradients all the way.

Mr. KATES said he would, in the first instance, refer to the statement made by the member for Port Curtis as to twenty miles of the line traversing the Main Range. According to the report of Mr. Phillips, inspecting surveyor, a saving of seven miles had been effected by the last survey.

Mr. NORTON: There will be more yet before the line is made.

Mr. KATES said there might be more yet. Mr. Phillips said:—

"With reference to my report dated 13th August last, commenting on the proposal of the Warwick Progress Committee, it appears from Mr. C. B. Lethem's report, dated 29th September, that the Range at the head of Swan Creek can be pierced by a tunnel about 35 chains in length at a depth from summit of 560 feet. This, you will observe, is considerably more favourable than I anticipated—namely, that a tunnel 650 feet below summit would require to be nearly a mile in length."

Further on he said:—

"It is evident that this point in the Range is peculiarly favourable for tunnelling, as the slopes on both sides are exceptionally steep.

"From the table of comparative distances given below, you will observe that a saving of at least seven miles in length to construct would accrue from the adoption of the Swan Creek route, and I fancy that the saving would be rather more, as I think Mr. Lethem has somewhat underrated his distances on the Millar's Vale Creek route."

Hon. members would therefore see that so far from there being twenty miles over the Main Range there were only thirteen, for seven from twenty left thirteen, and Mr. Phillips thought that distance might yet be still further lessened. It was his (Mr. Kates's) opinion that if they were called upon to reject eighteen of the twenty votes on those Loan Estimates they could not do better than retain the lines from Ipswich to Warwick and from Warwick to St. George. The leader of the Opposition had told them that they might just as well make a branch line from Yeulba or Roma. He, however, differed from the hon. gentleman. The intention was to open up large tracts of agricultural country. It had always been his opinion that they could never do wrong in constructing lines through agricultural land, and the railway projected would pass through rich arable country such as that in the Bremer Valley, Rosevale district, and Franklyn Vale. It had been said that the line would only effect a saving of fifty odd miles, but that was not the case, for it would be a saving to the farmers of Freestone Creek and Killarney of ninety miles. The distance by Toowoomba was 170 miles, but by the direct line from Ipswich to Warwick it would only be eighty or eighty-five miles. It had also been argued that it would be time enough in five years to consider such a line, but when it was remembered that it would take four or five years to

construct the railway, and that by that time there would be an absolute necessity for it, as the present narrow gauge from Brisbane to Charleville would not be able to carry all the traffic, he thought they should not delay the matter. He had observed that the bridges on the Main Range were collapsing, and that several new piles had been put in within the last month or two. It was his intention to quote, in support of the line now before the Committee, the remarks of a few eminent leading politicians in Queensland when it was spoken of about two years ago. About that time the late member for Darling Downs, Mr. Allan, brought forward a motion for a survey, and the hon. member for Townsville, the Hon. J. M. Macrossan, then said:—

"Such a line would be a great boon to the country, because it would undoubtedly give a great impetus to the Southern border traffic—besides shortening the distance to Sydney very considerably, the latter line being one he hoped to see through within three years."

The late member for Stanley, Mr. P. O'Sullivan, also gave his own opinion on the subject. That gentleman was not in the House now, but his words were worth quoting on that question. He said:—

"There was not an inch of country spoken of which he had not been over himself, and a finer district he did not know; as for the timber, there was not such a good description in any other part of the colony that he had been in. He would support such a line with a clear conscience, not only on account of its securing them the border traffic, but on account of the immense tract of agricultural country which would be opened by it."

Other gentlemen spoke in favour of the line, among whom was the member for Toowoomba, Mr. Groom. He said:—

"He approved of the survey of the line, and suggested that the land alongside of it should be at once reserved and withdrawn from sale. He did not suppose one could find in the colony of Queensland more delightful scenery and beautiful land than in the neighbourhood of Swan Creek and Killarney."

There could be no doubt that if that direct line were made it would open up not less than 250,000 acres of good agricultural land, the produce of which, when facilities of transit were given, would be sent to Brisbane at a much cheaper rate than now *via* Toowoomba. The distance by the present line was 170 or 180 miles.

Mr. ALAND: 165 miles.

Mr. KATES: 180 miles from Swan Creek where the bulk of the farmers were settled. Some time since he moved for a return to be laid on the table showing the amount of agricultural produce raised in the Warwick district; and he found that notwithstanding the bad season, that the district had produced no less than 24,000 bushels of wheat, and that the area of land under cultivation was 26,000 acres. He was in a position to say that now there were no less than 40,000 acres under cultivation, and that half-a-million bushels of wheat would be produced in the district; in fact, the millers of the Darling Downs were compelled to provide additional storage accommodation for the wheat. Besides the wheat there was a large quantity of maize produced. It should be remembered that only a small portion of the land was under cultivation; the great bulk of it was still in the hands of large landholders. Canning Downs, Yandilla, and Headington Hill stations were in the vicinity of the projected line. Close settlement would produce a greater amount of produce, and he had reason to believe that before the end of twelve months all those stations would be open for close settlement. The necessity of the line had been recognised by the principal merchants and importers of Brisbane. The petition that he presented to the House not long since was headed by the most influential merchants in Brisbane.



They had no more leaning towards Warwick than towards Toowoomba, but they had seen the necessity for the line. He would read the names so that hon. members might know who they were. There was the Queensland Mercantile and Agency Company, George Harris and Company, Robert Harper and Company, Berkley, Taylor, and Company, D. L. Brown and Company, Elliott Bros. and Company, Burns, Philp, and Company, Quinlan, Gray, and Company, John Cameron, W. B. Brown, Gibbs, Bright, and Company, Wilson and Company, Barker and Company, Maurice D. Benjamin and Company, S. Hoffnung and Company, Henry Box and Son, R. D. Neilson, Webster and Company, Benjamin Bros., Ran-niger, Horsley and Company, and several others. With regard to the hon. member for Toowoomba (Mr. Groom), he was told that he was opposed to the line because the people of Toowoomba were against it. Now, he (Mr. Kates) would read what the hon. member said in his paper at the time of the Emu Vale banquet. The hon. member told the people in his paper of the 17th June that he was in favour of such a line. He said :—

"We have enough of the curtain lifted to satisfy us that the Ministry in the great work they have undertaken ought to have the undivided support not only of the Liberal party in Parliament, but every colonist who values the welfare and progress of this great colony before party. There is to be a direct line from Brisbane to Warwick, continued to the very corner of the colony, *via* St. George, Cunnamulla, and Thargomindah. The money will be spent on reproductive public works which will in a short time pay the interest on the outlay."

Mr. GROOM said he did not want to interrupt the hon. member, but he was bound to say that at the time of the Emu Vale banquet he happened to be in Townsville, so that he had no more to do with the writing of that article than the hon. gentleman himself.

A HONOURABLE MEMBER: You are responsible for it.

Mr. KATES: The hon. gentleman knew what went into the paper. There was not a paragraph nor an article in the paper that did not come from the hon. gentleman's pen—at least, that was his (Mr. Kates's) opinion, though he might be wrong.

Mr. GROOM said it was a rule of parliamentary practice that, when an hon. member made an assertion and it was denied, the denial was accepted. The hon. member had charged him with uttering a deliberate untruth.

Mr. KATES said he would accept the hon. gentleman's denial. The leader of the Opposition said they ought to commence the line at St. George and take it to Roma or Dalby eastward. He (Mr. Kates) would tell the hon. member that it was the duty of the State to open up new country, especially if it was agricultural country, and not take it through such a howling wilderness as from St. George to Roma. He did not think they would see a single person from one end of that district to the other. The country had been the grave of a good many squatters, and there was not likely to be any settlement there. He could prove what he said on the authority of a former member of that House, a gentleman now dead—that was the late member for Balonne. That gentleman (Mr. Jacob Low) knew every inch of the country between St. George and Warwick. Three years ago he moved for the survey of a line between those places, and on that occasion he said :—

"The Warwick to St. George line would be one of the best lines of railway the Government could construct, and would bring additional traffic to the metropolis. He thought that the lands around Goondiwindi and Talwood would grow anything, and were equal to any in Queensland. He (Mr. Low) said if the Queensland

Government delayed making that line, New South Wales, by pushing on their line to Mungindi, would draw the districts of Cunnamulla and Curriwillinghi, and not a pound of wool would come to Brisbane—it would all go to Sydney."

He had other quotations, but he would reserve them till the line from Warwick to St. George came before them. In the meantime, he should rest satisfied that hon. members would see the necessity of a direct line from Brisbane to Warwick. It was a line that would pay well; and it would go through rich agricultural country below the range and extraordinary superior land above the range. As for the timber trade, it would pay well. He had no hesitation in saying that there was a million feet of timber at the head of the Condamine and about there. Cedar, beech, and pine would be brought down to Brisbane if the rates were lowered.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN asked the Colonial Treasurer what was the distance between Warwick and St. George?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: 235½ miles.

Mr. ALAND said it was a common practice when a man had a bad case to abuse the opposite side, and it struck him that the hon. member for Darling Downs, from his remarks, felt that he had a very bad case indeed. The hon. member commenced by abusing other parts of the colony. In advocating a direct line to Warwick, there was no need for the hon. member to speak disparagingly of the country lying between Dalby and St. George. The hon. gentleman made another remark to which he felt bound to take exception. Although a not much younger man than the hon. member, he would give him a little bit of advice, and that was to be very careful indeed what statements he made in the House. The hon. member had made statements before for which he had had to be called to book. The statement to which he (Mr. Aland) took exception now was that to the effect that the bridges on the Main Range line were collapsing. Was that a statement that ought to be made in that Committee?—a statement which the hon. member knew to be without foundation; a statement likely to create a panic in the minds of people travelling up and down the Main Range. A statement like that was one which no member ought to make unless he was positively assured of his facts, which he was certain the hon. member was not. The hon. member for Mackay, in speaking on a previous vote, gave it as his opinion that if the direct line to Warwick, and the extension from Warwick towards St. George, were constructed, Toowoomba would become a very small town indeed. He (Mr. Aland) did not hold that opinion; and in his opposition to the direct line to Warwick he was not actuated by any feeling of that kind. He had held, and had stated publicly, that a direct line from Ipswich to Warwick might be made, and a line from Warwick to St. George might be made, and the interests of Toowoomba would not suffer one iota. He might of course be wrong in that opinion; and there was a venerable old gentleman living at Toowoomba who, at a public meeting there the other night, told the people that if those lines were made they would have to put up their shutters, and their property would fall 50 per cent. in value. But that gentleman often made very rash statements, no matter where he was or what company he was in. The advocates of that line gave their reasons for it;—first, that it would tap the border trade; second, that it would shorten the distance between Brisbane and Warwick; and third, that it would ease the traffic on the existing line. With regard to the latter reason, he maintained, and would be able to prove, that



no easement of traffic was required, at all events as far as the southern branch of the railway was concerned. The print of the return quoted by the hon. member for Darling Downs was so small that he was unfortunately unable to read it; but he knew it showed that the small amount of agricultural produce grown in Warwick did not at all warrant any additional railway accommodation being provided for that town. Some wayside stations on the Southern and Western Railway provided more traffic than the town of Warwick did. He held in his hands a paper containing a number of figures taken from the report of the Commissioner for Railways for the year 1882-3 and the following year. Those figures showed that in 1882-3 the agricultural produce sent by railway was as follows:—From Ipswich, 5,089 tons, freight paid £940 10s. 8d.; from Laidley, 2,880 tons, freight paid £1,255; from Gatton, 1,291 tons, freight paid £749; from Toowoomba, 2,678 tons, freight paid £2,953; from Warwick, 1,883 tons, freight paid £1,315; from Rosewood, 1,552 tons, freight paid £427. In 1883, which was a very much better year—a really good year, and he questioned whether it would not be some time before the returns were much increased upon—the figures were as follows: From Ipswich, 10,431 tons, freight paid £2,445; from Laidley, 6,177 tons, freight paid £2,612; from Gatton, 2,649 tons, freight paid £1,445; from Toowoomba, 6,802 tons, freight paid £7,809; from Warwick, 4,385 tons, freight paid £3,286; from Rosewood, 3,365 tons, freight paid £834. The entire agricultural produce carried on the Southern and Western Railway during 1882-3 was 24,969 tons, and the freight paid £13,938. In 1883 the amount carried was 48,924 tons, and the freight paid £26,265. As far as agricultural produce was concerned, he thought he had proved that one of the reasons given—to ease the traffic on the line—had no foundation in actual facts.

Mr. KATES: Absurd!

Mr. ALAND: The hon. member was pleased to say "Absurd!" Well, it was very absurd, and he was only surprised that the Government should have brought such an absurd railway before the House. He had taken those figures from the whole of the traffic returns on the Southern and Western Railway for the years mentioned, and they of course included all the merchandise carried on the line as well. The outward traffic, Brisbane station, was 40,800 tons, and freight paid £99,382; Ipswich, 21,056 tons, freight paid £11,963; Toowoomba, 11,755 tons, freight paid £15,738; Warwick, 6,180 tons, freight paid £6,108. Roma—hon. members would notice that—Roma, 4,542 tons, freight paid £14,669. Now the inward traffic was as follows:—Brisbane, 75,569 tons, freight paid £64,388; Ipswich, 27,298 tons, freight paid £7,384; Toowoomba, 16,486 tons, freight paid £20,948; Warwick, 7,306 tons, freight paid £10,926. The round total amounted to 16,872 tons, and the freight paid was £45,995. Now look at the wool trade. There was carried on the Southern and Western line in 1883, 50,129 bales of wool, and of that number the western districts—that was those places west of Toowoomba—contributed 31,665 bales. Cambooya contributed 5,661 bales, Toowoomba 6,403, and Warwick 1,500. The balance between the figures he had read and the 50,129 bales was made up at stations between Cambooya and Warwick. In the face of those returns he should like to ask what traffic in wool there was that required easement. He should trouble the House with another return, because it was really a very important matter—the passenger traffic. In 1883 the tickets issued at the Brisbane station were 207,780, representing £82,009; Ipswich, 79,889, representing £9,604;

Toowoomba, 24,103, representing £10,225; Warwick, 7,446, representing £2,990; and Roma 6,260, representing £6,438. And the tickets collected at those stations were:—Brisbane, 187,162, representing £27,180; Ipswich 64,333, representing £9,681; Toowoomba, 25,079, representing £11,476; Warwick, 7,184, representing £3,012 14s. 7d.; Roma, 6,055, representing £5,836 17s. 3d. He thought from those returns hon. members must be satisfied that as far as easement of traffic was concerned the argument was simply ridiculous. The Minister for Works had talked about the necessity for duplicating the line on the range in order that the Warwick traffic might be eased. If there was any easement required it was the traffic extending from Toowoomba westward, but it would be some time before that was required. The time had not come when the Main Range line wanted duplicating in any shape or form. Now the argument had been used that the line would tap the border traffic. He did not know what hon. members thought about that, but he was quite sure of this, that they might do all they possibly could and they would never attract the border traffic down to Brisbane, notwithstanding the memorial which was signed by all the Brisbane merchants. Would not Brisbane merchants sign a memorial for making a railway to the moon if they thought that by that means they could increase their trade. He would just read a paragraph from the reports of the debates of the New South Wales Parliament when the railway proposals were being discussed. Mr. Burns made a statement to this effect, and it was a statement which could not be contradicted because it was based on Government charges:—

"The statement of the Railway Department went to show that there was no portion of the traffic which paid better than the carriage of wool. I was informed some time ago with reference to these differential rates that the charge from Armidale to Newcastle, a distance of 260 miles, was 10s. 6d. per bale. From Narrabri to Newcastle, 252 miles, it was 10s. per bale, and from Nyngan to Sydney, 377 miles, 11s. per bale. This is for a distance of 177 miles in excess of the distance from Armidale to Newcastle, yet the charge is only 11s. per bale."

Could they do anything like that? He was not himself a wool-grower, he was sorry to say, but he knew that wool was not carried on the Queensland railways at anything approaching such a rate. Would anyone tell him that even if the New South Wales people could not afford, they would not do it; because experience had proved that in the battle between them and Victoria they maintained their point, and the Victorians had not been able to get the Riverina trade. New South Wales had got it and would stick to it, and they would stick to the Queensland border trade, and carry their produce far cheaper, even if they could not afford it, than Queensland could in anywise do or attempt to do. Now, was it right that the colony should be put to that very large expense of a million of money in order to construct the Ipswich and Warwick line?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Do not exaggerate.

Mr. ALAND said he did not intend to exaggerate. He had it on the authority of an engineer who was well qualified to speak on the subject, that the line could not be constructed under more than a million of money. That gentleman would stake his reputation on it, and he had a reputation to lose.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Give us his name.

Mr. ALAND said he had not the slightest objection to name the gentleman. It was Mr. Thorneloe Smith, and he would take that opportunity of saying a word for Mr. Thorneloe Smith. He might be a man of irascible temper, who

could not get on very well with those over him or under him, but he had been an honest servant of the Government and had conducted to the best of his ability—and that ability was a large one—the works entrusted to him. He would go farther, and say he did not believe the Government had done a generous thing in dispensing with the services of Mr. Thorneloe Smith without the slightest recompense for his long service. He would say no more, but as he had been asked to name Mr. Smith he had said what he felt on the subject.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS :** You have never been a contractor.

**MR. ALAND :** No, thank goodness ! He hoped hon. members had read the report of Mr. Phillips. It would be very interesting to know how much that report had cost. It dated back to 1883, and he was told the surveyors were at work still. The Warwick Progress Association—and he spoke of them with all respect—certainly seemed to have had a good finger in the money set apart for the survey of railways. It would be a good thing to know how much that association had cost the country in making all those different surveys. What did Mr. Phillips say in reference to the line which the Government had chosen ?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS :** We have not chosen one.

**MR. ALAND :** That was an admission he did not expect to hear the Government make, as the Government had said that the line they had chosen would save fifty-three miles. He would tell the Committee that if they accepted the line the engineer recommended it would only save a distance of twenty-six miles ; and Mr. Phillips pointed out that that was the line which ought to be made, having regard for economy. The Minister for Works generally told them he knew nothing about surveys or routes, and left those things to the surveyor, but when it suited the hon. gentleman's purpose he threw the engineer on one side, and instead of adopting the No. 5 line, as Mr. Phillips suggested, he was evidently, according to the statement of the Colonial Treasurer, going to adopt the No. 2 line, which saved fifty-three miles. Mr. Phillips said :—

" Trial surveys were commenced in April last, and after a careful examination of the Main Range the point selected for crossing is close to the Spicer's Peak Road Gap.

" Thence the contour has been carried down the north-eastern face of the Range for eighteen miles.

" The gradient adopted is an uniform one of 1 in 63.

" At first it was thought the line"—

That bore out the statement that that was the line the Ministry had accepted—

" At first it was thought the line would join the Fassifern branch at Harrisville, but the result of the survey shows this to be practically impossible, without a serious concession in the matter of gradients. The line is now trending down the left bank of the Bremer River towards Rosewood on the Southern and Western Railway.

" The works will probably prove quite as heavy, if not perhaps so costly, as those on the Main Range between Helidon and Toowoomba.

" In consequence of the action of the Warwick Progress Committee, a special examination has been made of the Range at the head of Swan Creek, from which it appears that it is at least desirable that an alternative survey be made by that route."

He was very sorry that he should be thought to be actuated by any other motive than a desire to save the country from being committed to such an extravagant expenditure. That million of money would suffice to send their main trunk lines to a very much greater distance out where they really ought to go. It was no use calling the proposed line a trunk line ; it was not even a coast line. Talking about that, if they wanted a shorter route to New South Wales, they had

already sanctioned the Southport line, and the New South Wales people had met them by coming from Newcastle to Grafton.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS :** No.

**MR. ALAND :** I think so. I think I read it.

**MR. FOXTON :** Not along the coast.

**MR. ALAND :** They could not go very much farther west unless they went right slap-bang up to Glen Innes.

**MR. FOXTON :** That is where they are going.

**MR. ALAND :** Not at all. The New South Wales people were not going to build a railway in such a " gerrymandering " fashion as that. If they wanted to shorten the distance between Brisbane and New South Wales, that was the route they should adopt. It would be a saving of 200 miles.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS :** And would not take anything away from Toowoomba.

**MR. ALAND** said he thought that was very unfair. He had already disclaimed any feeling of localism in the matter. He held that the proposed line would not injure Toowoomba one iota. He would say what he had not intended to say, that personally it would benefit him—both that line and the next one on the Loan Estimates. If there were any hon. members in the Committee whom those lines would benefit, they were the hon. member for Darling Downs, the hon. member for Warwick, and himself.

**MR. KATES :** No.

**MR. ALAND :** Well, he would only speak for himself. When he could not afford to be in the House without having regard to his own private matters, he would take his leave.

**MR. KATES** said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Aland) had doubted whether there were any new piles under the bridges in the main ridge ; but if he went there on Saturday he would see no less than fifteen or twenty new piles put in within the last two months. The hon. gentleman actually had had the audacity to compare the agricultural resources of Warwick with those of Toowoomba. Why, Toowoomba was a cabbage-garden compared with Warwick ! Toowoomba had to come to Warwick to find wheat to keep its mills going. The Toowoomba district had not proved to be a wheat-growing district, while that year the Warwick district had produced no less than half-a-million bushels of wheat. The hon. gentleman had forgotten to say that the Warwick flour went to Roma and Charleville. He took no account of that.

**MR. ALAND** said that the figures which he had quoted, no matter what the hon. member for Darling Downs made of them, showed unmistakably that a much larger amount of produce was received at and sent from Toowoomba than Warwick. Where it was grown he did not know. It was grown somewhere in the vicinity of Toowoomba. At least they did not send it down from Warwick. In reference to the flour, the hon. member might as well have told the Committee that the Warwick people got a great concession in the matter of flour. They got their flour sent up to Mitchell for £2 12s. 6d. a ton, but a ton of Adelaide flour cost £3 12s. 6d. to go to the same place. He was reminded by the presence of the hon. member for Warrego that that gentleman had, in order to attend the House, to travel something like 500 miles before he reached a railway station. They should consider the requirements of his district before they attempted to duplicate the line between Brisbane and the Main Range.

**MR. DONALDSON** said he thought the two speeches they had just heard from the hon. members for Darling Downs and Toowoomba had been very full indeed, and had given the

Committee all the information they could desire. Any further speeches were not likely to influence hon. members who had received sufficient information to enable them to make up their minds. He wanted to ask a favour on behalf of himself and other hon. members who were living long distances from home. Christmas was approaching — a time when all persons liked to be at home with their families. It would only be showing some fair consideration for them if the Committee would now proceed to business and get that matter put to the vote. And he trusted that on other questions that came up there would be short speeches. He was anxious to get home, but he liked to see the business of the House finished before starting, and he trusted the favour he had asked would be acceded to and the vote be now taken.

Mr. STEVENSON said he hoped the Committee were not going to burk discussion because the hon. member for Warrego wanted to get away home. The discussion was a very important and interesting one. He was getting a great deal of information from it, and had not yet made up his mind as to how he should vote.

Mr. FOXTON said he had intended saying something, but he felt inclined to agree with the hon. member for Warrego, that everybody had pretty well made up their minds.

Mr. HORWITZ said he had travelled over the ground lately and was satisfied that a line a great deal nearer and better could be made. Many hon. members were not aware that the distance from Brisbane to Warwick was only ninety-five miles by Swan Creek and Spicer's Peak, and through lands which were in the hands of the Government and fit for settlement. From the eastern side of Spicer's Peak to the foot of the Range was only thirteen miles, and the line could be constructed at about £10,000 a mile, while all the ground from the foot of the mountains was level, and the line there could be constructed for £3,000 a mile. It seemed to him that Toowoomba objected to that line because the people there were very much afraid that Warwick would take away their trade. Mr. James Taylor had said so at their meeting, and that their property would go down 50 per cent. if the new line was made. It had been said that Paris was France, but Toowoomba was not Queensland yet. It was hardly worth while for him to say any more upon the subject, as they were anxious to come to a division.

Mr. JESSOP said that so much had been said upon the subject that it was not necessary for him to say very much, except to register his objection to it. The hon. member for Toowoomba had placed facts and figures before the Committee, and he thought, with the hon. member for Warrego, that all that could be said had been said. He took objection to what had been said by the hon. member for Darling Downs, that the country between Dalby and St. George was a howling wilderness. When he compared the traffic returns of Warwick with those of Dalby he found that the former were a trifle greater. But the wool traffic was a great deal less. The wool traffic from Dalby last year was 4,665 bales, and from Warwick, 1,500 bales. He objected to the expenditure of that £500,000, which was only a first instalment and would not finish the railway.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that, although he had a great deal of sympathy with the hon. member for Warrego, who wanted to get home, he could not allow the item to go to a vote without saying what he had to say about it. Hon. members were perfectly aware that he started a survey of that line from Warwick; so that he was entitled to have his say upon the

subject. No matter what might have been said by hon. members on either side, either inside or outside of the Committee or in electioneering, they should count the cost to the country of what they were going to do. That seemed to be the most important part of the whole discussion. It should not be a question between Warwick and Toowoomba, because if it were a question of that kind Warwick would get the worst of it. If hon. members would take the trouble to read the Commissioner's reports for the last five years, they would find that Warwick was in a worse position now than last year, and worse last year than the year before. The traffic receipts were only £25,000, and if the working expenses were to be taken out of that there would be very little left indeed. When they were going to indulge in another line to Warwick at a cost of about a million, it was time to reckon up the cost to the country, leaving Warwick out of the question. The Colonial Treasurer said that the line would tap the southern border traffic. Then it became a question of whether the southern border traffic was really worth that line, with the line to St. George. The estimate of the engineer, Mr. Thorneloe Smith, was called into question. He did not think there was the slightest reason for calling his ability into question, whatever his temper or his conduct towards his subordinates might be. He did not think there was one single authority in Queensland more competent to give a correct estimate than that gentleman. He was the gentleman who was responsible for the survey of the line over the Main Range, so that he ought to know something about range constructions. What were the facts so far as they could gather from Mr. Phillips' report? Not as stated by the hon. member for Darling Downs, who said the whole of the Range was thirteen miles. There were sixteen miles of Range for only four miles' actual distance, and there were nearly twenty-five miles of Range, according to a later report. Each hon. gentleman had his opinion about the cost on the Main Range to Toowoomba. The total cost from Ipswich to Toowoomba up to the present time, on the main line, had been £16,000 per mile; but the line from Helidon to Toowoomba was a vast deal more than that. When he was in office he tried to ascertain what was the actual cost, but could not find it out. From the system of bookkeeping that was in existence at the time that the Main Range was ascended, it was almost impossible to ascertain what was the cost of the Main Range section. However, he did ascertain that the cost was at least £20,000 per mile. At that rate the twenty-five miles of Range upon the Warwick line would just take up the whole of the sum that the Minister for Works asked for, leaving the rest of the line to construct, and the finding of the rolling-stock, and the building of the stations. He thought Mr. Thorneloe Smith was quite within the mark when he said it would cost nearly a million of money to build that line. Were they in a position to spend a million of money at the present time? He did not say that the line should not ultimately be made, but it was a question of cost, and a question of justice and fair play to other parts of the colony which were a long way from railway communication. When they reckoned that it would cost a million, they must also reckon what would be the interest upon that, and what would be the expense in the maintenance of the line after it was constructed. He maintained that the interest and cost of maintenance of the line would exceed by three times the net receipts for a long time to come; and were they justified in placing the colony in the position of being pledged to maintain a line at such a cost when there were other parts of the colony, south, north, and west,

that were crying out, and had a strong claim for railway communication? They were not; and what they might be justified in doing for the purpose of opening up a short route to Sydney was another matter. They had adopted already one route to New South Wales, which, when put into communication with the line from Grafton to the Tweed, would be much shorter than the proposed line *via* Warwick. They had voted money yesterday for a line from Brisbane to Southport and the border, so that they would meet the New South Wales line in the direction of the shortest route. Then they were getting a line from Warwick to St. George, which the Colonial Treasurer said would tap the southern traffic, and that line, according to the report of the railway surveyor, Mr. Phillips, was 235½ miles in length. If they took 235 miles at £5,000 a mile—which he thought was a moderate estimate, counting stations and rolling-stock, especially when they found from the surveyor's report that on one particular part of the land to be traversed there was a large amount of flooded country—the line would cost £1,100,000. So that the expenditure they were now asked to commit themselves to would actually amount to £2,000,000 or over, demanding a yearly interest at 4½ per cent.—which was about the cost of the money they got—of £90,000. The cost of maintenance too would be enormous. They had lines at present in existence the traffic upon which was not sufficient to pay the cost of maintenance, let alone the interest on the original construction. They had, in fact, too many of those railways already, and if they continued building non-payable lines such as those for many years they would launch themselves into the position of being obliged to increase the taxation of the general body of the people for the purpose of making up the deficiency. The Government ought to consider that. He did not believe that the Government really believed in that line.

**THE COLONIAL TREASURER:** Oh yes, they do.

**THE HON. J. M. MACROSSAN:** The Colonial Treasurer said yes, but he did not think the hon. gentleman believed in the line, and he was sure the Minister for Lands had too much good sense to do so. That line appeared to be put down on the Estimates because the late Government had ordered a survey to be made chiefly for the purpose of ascertaining the best route, and because it was foolishly promised in a moment of exhilaration by the Minister for Works. They were asked on that to commit the country to an expenditure of two millions, when they could get a line, which would serve equally well, built in a shorter time for one-fifth of the money, or about £400,000. If they were to get the border trade and retain it, it was desirable that the line should be built as soon as possible. If they waited to construct the line now proposed they would not be able to get that trade, as it would go to the people of New South Wales, and they would have to fight for it. What would be the result of that might easily be anticipated. They had had an example of what might be expected in the fight between New South Wales and Victoria. Victoria had actually got the Riverina trade, but when the New South Wales line reached Riverina the latter colony took the trade away from Victoria. Queensland could not do that, because the Government would not be allowed to manage the railways in the same way as they did in New South Wales. All the lines in that colony centred in Sydney, and what was done there was done for the benefit of the whole colony. But in Queensland they had too many trunk lines, and no Minister would be allowed to have differential traffic rates

in the South without having the same in the North, and that would ruin their railway trade. That was the reason he did not believe in that line from Ipswich to Warwick. Let the Minister, if he chose, select the best route for survey and keep the land from sale, so that when the time came that it was necessary to construct the line they would not have to buy the land. The shorter and the better route at present would be from Southport to Grafton and on to Glen Innes, and if they wished to secure the south-west border trade the St. George line should, in his opinion, start from Yeulba and not from Warwick.

Mr. J. CAMPBELL said he did not know that he had ever seen such scratching-back work. It really appeared to him that in those votes it was a case of "you scratch my back and I will scratch yours." He was afraid they were not counting the cost of those lines. He was not so anxious for the money to be borrowed and for those lines to be constructed, as a good many hon. members were; nor did he, like the hon. member for Maryborough, think that all those railways would be paying lines. They ought to take into consideration that, if all those votes were passed, every member for whose district a line was voted would push the Minister for Works, in order to have it constructed as early as possible. They ought also to take into consideration the labour market, and the little industries that were springing up in the colony. What would be the state of them if so many lines were pushed on at the same time, and what would be the state of the farming population? It was certain that farmers could not pay the wages railway contractors could, consequently they would not be able to get the necessary labour to till their lands; and instead of obtaining from them the produce they required, the people would have to send to New South Wales or elsewhere for it. He was as anxious as any member of that Committee to see a vigorous works policy carried out; but he could not say that he approved of ten millions of money being voted at once. He might be a renegade in speaking as he did, but he thought it was quite enough for the Government to borrow sufficient money to carry them on to the end of the present Parliament. He hoped at the expiration of that time that they might be returned to power again, but he did not think they were justified in asking for money to carry them on beyond the present Parliament. It appeared to him that there was a feeling throughout the colony that they should take the border traffic from New South Wales. He thought, however, that it had been proved that evening beyond a doubt that they could not do so. But he would ask why they should try to do it when so many of their own resources were yet undeveloped, and there were people in the west and other directions famishing for want of railways. He was sure it would be much better to build lines there than trying to get the border traffic. He was sorry the member for Warwick should seem so narrow-minded as to imagine that the people of Toowoomba were fretting very much about that line, because they were not. He (Mr. Campbell), like the member for Toowoomba, did not think the construction of the line would affect Toowoomba; at any rate, it would not affect it to any extent. As to the statement that they were the persons who had tried to work up that opposition, that he must deny. The member for Toowoomba and he were pledged to oppose the line, but his reason for doing so was the enormous cost. He was sure that Mr. Thorneloe Smith's estimate was not far out—that it would cost £1,000,000 to take the line to Warwick. What it would cost to take it to St. George he (Mr. Campbell) did not know, but he knew that there

was very little agricultural land on the route. After leaving Warwick the line would pass over a barren granite ridge for about fourteen or fifteen miles until it reached Warroo. There they would get a few thousand acres of agricultural country, but after leaving Inglewood the land would not grow enough to feed a rat. After going a little further, they came across a little patch of agricultural land, and after that there was swampy country which was good for cattle and sheep in the dry parts, but unfit for agriculture. He was quite sure there would never be settlement there. It seemed to him that the Warwick people were very fond of being dry-nursed by one Ministry and wet-nursed by another. They never let the late Ministry alone until they got a concession for their waterworks; and now, through the influence of their Association, they had managed to persuade the Minister for Works into that line. If hon. members looked at that report they would see that no less than three times, after the Warwick association had asked him, had he recommended that a surveyor be sent to make another survey. He (Mr. Campbell) was surprised that the hon. gentleman allowed himself to be put in that position; he appeared to be completely in their hands and had acted on their recommendation in every case.

Mr. ISAMBERT rose to speak.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Question, question.

Question—That there be granted by way of loan a sum of £500,000 for the construction of a line from Ipswich to Warwick—put.

The Committee divided :—

AYES, 24.

Messrs. Rutledge, Dickson, Dutton, Sheridan, Miles, Smyth, Buckland, Isambert, Foote, Grimes, Macfarlane, Foxton, Jordan, Bailey, Kellett, Macdonald-Paterson, Beattie, White, Salkeld, Midgley, Annear, Kates, Higson, and Horwitz.

NOES, 17.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Macrossan, Black, Jessop, Stevenson, Archer, Norton, Donaldson, Stevens, Lalor, Ferguson, Scott, J. Campbell, Chubb, Groom, Aland, and Nelson.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Pair: For—The Hon. S. W. Griffith; against—Mr. Palmer.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that there be granted by way of loan a sum of £250,000 for a railway from Warwick towards St. George. The line had been pretty well debated already, in connection with the last vote, and therefore he did not think it necessary to say much about it, except to again express the opinion that it was the complement of the line just passed. He thought it would be extended in due time, not only to St. George, but to Cunnamulla. The hon. member for Mulgrave had stated that he thought the country would be best served by a branch line to Yeulba; but he (the Colonial Treasurer) did not agree with that. He thought the line must run to the southern border. There was, he believed, room for this and the line just passed, without their running in competition with each other.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that several hon. members, speaking on the last vote, had stated that they had come to the conclusion that the object of running a railway along the border was to take away the trade from New South Wales. There was no desire to do anything of the sort. What they wanted was to secure the trade of Queensland, and those lines would do that. It was all very well to advocate a line from Dalby to St. George; but anyone who looked at the route would see that the people on the southern border would obtain no advantage from that whatever. The line would run parallel with the border, and accommodate the traffic down towards St. George

and Cunnamulla. That was the line which above all, in his opinion, deserved the support of the Committee.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS of the Opposition: You said that about the last railway.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Let hon. members compare that line with the one proposed by the hon. member for Mulgrave. That hon. member wanted to build a railway from Charleville to the border, a distance from Brisbane of somewhere about 700 miles. The present was a direct line, and would be beneficial to all who were located on the border of the colony. All the country it would go through was not first-class. The hon. member for Aubigny talked about granite ranges, but he knew the country as well as that hon. member, and it was nonsense to talk about granite ranges. In whatever way St. George was approached there would be a lot of inferior country to go through, and it was the same on all their western lines. Whether the line went from Dalby, Yeulba, or Roma, it would have to go through poor country until it reached far enough west to get into the plain country. He was satisfied that the line proposed was the proper line to secure the border trade, and that was the object the Government had in view in proposing it.

Mr. NORTON asked how much the line would cost per mile?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It will be a very cheap line. It is over flat country.

Mr. JESSOP: Over flooded country.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There will be some watercourses to cross, but I believe it is the least costly of any line that has been surveyed.

Mr. NORTON: I wish to know how much the line will cost per mile?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: It will be about the average cost of lines going through flat country—between £3,000 and £4,000 a mile.

Mr. JESSOP said he could not allow the vote to pass without registering his objection to it—although, if he or any other hon. member on that side were to stand up and talk against it for three years in the Committee as at present constituted, it would not make a bit of difference. He looked upon the railway as the greatest piece of log-rolling ever perpetrated—as the greatest piece of humbug ever put before hon. members; but it was plain the Opposition were in a minority, and must accept their position. As to the line being a cheap one, if the hour were not so late, he would read the concluding portion of Mr. Surveyor Phillips' report upon it, which, if it did not convince the Minister for Works, would convince the country that the line would be anything but cheap. There were many creeks and rivers to cross, and a vast extent of flooded country. In some places flood-openings half-a-mile or a mile in width would have to be made; often there were fifteen feet of water for two or three miles at a stretch. And yet the hon. gentleman told them it would be a cheap line to construct! A line starting from Dalby would only have the Condamine River to cross, and would have the watershed of the Moonie right along. But it was of no use talking. If the line started from Dalby, the distance to St. George would be 54½ miles less than from Warwick. Warwick was 16 miles further from Brisbane than Dalby, and that would make it 70½ miles further from Brisbane to St. George by way of Warwick than by way of Dalby; and supposing two trains a day ran, that meant 140 miles' wear and tear of line and rolling-stock, which was needless. He expected there would be a division on the vote, and he thought he could count heads before it was taken.

Mr. FERGUSON said he intended to vote for every item on the Estimates now. The only item to which he had a great objection—the line from Ipswich to Warwick—had been passed, and the others would pass unopposed as far as he was concerned. The Minister for Works had told them on several occasions that he would oppose any line which would compete with lines already in existence. The line just passed, which would cost nearer a million than a half a million, was nothing but a competing line; and the result, he believed, would be that the paying capabilities of the Southern and Western Railway would be reduced by it from  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. Had they extended their main trunk lines, there would have been some sense in it; whereas a direct line to Warwick would simply injure existing lines without doing any good for itself.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No!

Mr. FERGUSON: He said, yes. The traffic which was now conveyed on the Toowoomba line would be divided between the two. The line was not going to increase the traffic as the extension of the Central line would do. The paying capabilities of the Southern and Western line would be reduced by it if anything. It was quite clear to him now that it was only the constituencies that got up public meetings, and deputations, that were listened to in the House. It was only those parts of the colony that were continually agitating whose wants were attended to. Not a single deputation had come from the district he represented, and not a single public meeting had been held to ask the Government for anything but what was just. But there were several lines the Committee were asked to pass through the influence of some progress association. The Warwick Association he believed had as much to do with the management of the country as the Government itself. He intended to vote for every single item although there were two or three other lines which would be a dead loss to the country. The Gayndah line would not pay for the grease on the wheels, but still he would not do Maryborough out of its share of the swindle. He had expected that some of the railways would have been opposed by the majority of members; but he saw there was no regard whatever paid to the welfare of the colony. Every vote had been given simply as a log-rolling vote. He said that without hesitation. He did not care whether a single line of railway was passed for the Central district; but he said that the Loan Estimates were a disgrace to the colony.

Mr. FOOTE said he presumed that all Loan Estimates were a disgrace to the colony; but the party in power framed the Estimates according to their own ideas, and he presumed they were framed in the interests of the colony. They did not expect hon. gentlemen on the other side to hold the same views as hon. gentlemen on the Government side held. The hon. gentleman who had just sat down did not seem very pleased. He seemed out of temper; but when he had been a few years in the House he would see that Loan Estimates were invariably gone through in the same way. The last Government served the hon. member exceedingly well, and that Rockhampton was not very badly served, he must admit. Every year since he had been in the House a sum of money was voted for the Fitzroy—enough money, in fact, to make a railway from Rockhampton to Gladstone, and a greater waste of money never took place. But no one objected to that. The Fitzroy was the only highway to the town of Rockhampton, and he supposed the House would have to continue to put up with an expenditure upon work that did not pay a shilling of interest. From all the information he had he believed the river was very little better than it

was at the commencement of the operations. The sore point with the hon. gentleman was the Ipswich and Warwick railway. He (Mr. Foote) had refrained from saying anything on that line, because he might have been considered an interested party; but he was not in that position, for he did not care whether the line was passed or not. The hon. gentleman said it would not increase the traffic, and would not pay interest on the money expended. Well, he (Mr. Foote) said he did not know much about it. So far as the foot of the range was concerned from Ipswich or Rosewood, there was some very good country. There was plenty of agricultural country, and abundance of timber. In fact, the Fassifern line should have the timber trade developed; and so great was it on that line that oftentimes there had been considerable difficulty in getting the timber carried, and the further the line went the more the traffic increased. The district through which the Warwick and Ipswich line would pass was a large producing district; and he was satisfied the line would pay. He could not say so much for the line to St. George, because he did not know the country. There was certainly something in the remarks of the hon. member for Dalby, in which he pointed out that a much shorter route could be found by starting from Dalby or Roma.

Mr. JESSOP: I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. FOOTE said he understood the hon. member to say that to go to St. George from Dalby would be fifty miles shorter than going from Warwick. There might be something in that, and so far there might be a saving of money to the country. He looked upon the Loan Estimates as being the policy of the Government. They were responsible for those Estimates. They on that side of the Committee had confidence in the Government, but they did not expect hon. gentlemen on the other side to have the same confidence. They would destroy the Estimates if they possibly could, and reduce the Government to such a state of confusion that it would be impossible to carry on. Looking at the Loan Estimates as a whole, he considered that they had been framed in the interests of the colony generally. He remembered that some years ago, when they passed a number of lines *in globo*, it was said that they would not pay for the grease on the wheels; and the policy was so bold on that occasion that the other House threw out the lines the first session they were introduced. They were passed the next session, however, and now those lines were, with about one exception, all good paying lines, and the best assets the colony produced.

Mr. ISAMBERT: Mr. Fraser—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Question, question! Question put.

Mr. KELLETT said that on one or two occasions the hon. member for Rosewood had been hushed down when he wanted to say a few words. He did not see why any hon. member should be prevented from expressing his reasons on any question before the Committee. As he was on his legs, he would say that he believed thoroughly in the St. George railway, and was satisfied it would be a great benefit to the colony. He had not spoken on the last line, because he thought they would get more quickly through the business, but he believed it would be the best line from Brisbane. It would go alongside the border, and take a lot of traffic that had hitherto gone to Maitland; while if they went round by Yeulba or Roma before turning down to St. George, the cost of bringing everything to Brisbane would be so great that they would get none of that traffic. He was satisfied that

the direct line to Warwick was the best line on the paper, and the extension to St. George was an addition which would be of great benefit to the colony. They would take traffic that would otherwise go to New South Wales, and as the Minister had said that the wide-gauge system would be started on the line to New South Wales, they would be able to compete favourably with that colony. They would only be about half the distance that Sydney was from the border, and the Tenterfield district would be as good as belonging to the colony.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he had been hushed down two or three times, and he thought it was because since last Tuesday the House was afraid of hearing disagreeable truths; but whether they wished it or not, they would hear a good many more disagreeable truths from him. He owed it as a duty to himself to explain why he voted for all those lines while he disagreed to the borrowing of money, and to set himself right he would give an explanation to-morrow.

Question put, and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 21.

Messrs. Sheridan, Dutton, Dickson, Miles, Annear, Smyth, Buckland Jordan, Isambert, Midgley, Horwitz, Grimes, Foote, Kellett, Kates, Rutledge, Foxton, Higson, Macfarlane, Salkeld, and Bailey.

NOES, 14.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Stevenson, Donaldson, Jessop, Archer, Norton, Chubb, Stevens, Lalor, Nelson, Ferguson, J. Campbell, Aland, and Groom.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Pair: For — Mr. Griffith; against — Mr. Palmer.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I beg to move—

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: We are not going any further to-night, Mr. Fraser.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he was sorry to hear the announcement of the hon. gentleman. He had already told the hon. member for Port Curtis that he would be satisfied if they got through the votes for the Southern and Western district.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said those items involved two or three hours' discussion yet. He had a good deal to say on the Ipswich vote.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he should be sorry to force the vote on the Committee; but as it was one of the last nights of the session, he thought they might fairly sit a little longer.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said they had been there since 3 o'clock, and had sat the whole of the week. The Premier was knocked up and had gone home. The Minister for Works could not manage the business, but the Government appeared determined to shove the Estimates through without discussion. He had a great deal to say on the Estimates, but he did not choose to say it now. They had no right to attempt to vote such an amount of money without due consideration; and the idea of getting through the next five items without discussion was simply absurd. There was no chance of finishing them to-night.

Mr. KELLETT said that during the present session they had adjourned earlier than in any other session, so far as his experience went. As a rule, during the last month of a session they sat till 12 o'clock, and sometimes till 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning, and he did not see why they should not do so now. By sitting a few hours later they would be able to finish before Christmas.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he quite agreed with the hon. member for Stanley (Mr. Kellett). The late Government did not show so much consideration for the Opposition as was shown by

the present Government; and he thought the Committee might sit another hour or two, so as to get through a part if not the whole of the Estimates.

Mr. STEVENSON said he did not think they had ever sat so many days a week and so many hours a day as they had during the past fortnight; and he felt sure that the Treasurer had the good sense to see that it was useless as well as unfair to attempt to go on with the business at so late an hour as half-past 11 o'clock.

Mr. FOOTE said that the business of the session had been carried on exceedingly well, and the adjournments had been early; and taking into consideration the fact that many members wished to get away on Saturday, so as to reach their homes by the middle of next week, it was only reasonable that they should sit two or three hours later, in order to bring the session to a close.

Mr. NORTON said the hon. member's speech was an argument in favour of the Government leaving important business till the last moment, and rushing it through almost without consideration. He was quite sure that when the present leader of the Government was in opposition he would have been the last man to allow such large sums of money to be voted at such an hour on such meagre information. When the last vote was under consideration, he asked the Minister for Works the estimated cost of the line from Warwick to St. George, but the hon. gentleman would not even go across to the gallery and ask the Engineer-in-Chief for the information. He said it would not cost more than the average—about £4,000 or £5,000 a mile—but that was not the sort of information to give the Committee.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he of course recognised the fact that if there was organised obstruction on the other side it was useless to proceed with the Estimates.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said there was not the slightest intention on his side of obstructing the Estimates. He had done as much as possible to forward them. It was his intention, and had been all through, to push the Estimates, for he wanted to see the session over. But what was the use of going on at that time of night when everybody was tired? The leaders of the Opposition, as the hon. gentlemen knew, were just as responsible, and had just as much work as the Ministry. To ask them to discuss five items before adjourning was too much.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had not accused the hon. gentleman of organised obstruction. What he said was that, if it was intended to be obstructive, there was no use going on.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: There is none.

The COLONIAL TREASURER submitted that as Friday was likely to be the last working night of the session, and as a great portion of the sitting would be taken up with the consideration of the Land Bill, they might fairly consent to sit a little longer. There was no desire to burk or limit discussion, but he hoped they would finish the votes for the Southern and Western Railway. They might be got through in an hour's time.

Mr. ISAMBERT said the remaining items were based on and consequential to the preceding votes. When they were finished with those votes, they were done with the rapacious South; and when they came to the North they would make much better progress. He thought the leader of the Opposition should make a concession, and go on.



The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said there was nothing consequential on the previous votes. If there was he would pass them. For instance, in regard to the Warwick and St. George vote: when it came on he acknowledged that the whole thing had been discussed on the previous item of Ipswich to Warwick, and therefore advised hon. gentlemen on his side of the Committee to say nothing, but simply take a division. But the other items were quite different, and they really wanted to discuss them. It was, however, too late. He remembered the leader of the House, when in opposition, going home and leaving two or three gentlemen to keep up the discussion to all hours simply to obstruct. He did not intend to do that. But it was unfair to members to discuss those items without giving them opportunity—full opportunity—for free discussion. The hon. gentleman besides knew that when members were fresh they came to a conclusion more rapidly than at that time of night.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he would submit for the consideration of the Committee the first item. He moved that there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1884-5, by way of loan, the sum of £50,000 to defray the expenses of the extension of the terminal station at Brisbane and for new offices for engineers.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked what was the work included in the £50,000—what was intended to be done? They had already voted £175,000 for the extension of the main line into the city, and to meet the Sandgate Branch. He wanted to know the details of that item. What was intended to be done with the terminal station, and in fact what was the estimate on which the sum of £50,000 was arrived at?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that a portion of the £50,000 was put down for the purpose of building offices for the Railway Department—for the Commissioner of Railways, clerks, etc. The present building was old and quite unsuitable. A portion of that money had been authorised by the late Government. Then there was £30,000 for additional accommodation at the railway station. Apart altogether from the passenger station, which was to be removed into the centre of the city, the traffic station required additional accommodation.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman had told the Committee nothing more than was in the paper. Had plans been designed? How had the £50,000 been arrived at? How did it come about, that having built offices for the Engineer's Department two or three years ago they were again asked to vote money for the same purpose?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that the Engineer had lately occupied the old Grammar School, which was entirely unsuitable.

Mr. NORTON said the old Grammar School was a perfect palace compared with the old Works Office which the late Minister for Works had occupied for years. And it was a great pity the present Minister for Works could not be shoved into that old office for a little, when he would understand how much superior the old Grammar School was to it. Was it necessary to pull down that really good building simply because it did not meet the requirements of the Railway Department? Might not the rooms which were wanted for the Engineer's offices be put up at a moderate cost instead of pulling down that good building—the old Grammar School—and putting up another at a cost of £20,000.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. member sanctioned the excavation for the extension of the railway station, and to give

additional accommodation, for £30,000. The £20,000 was for new offices for the Engineer's Department.

Mr. NORTON said the hon. gentleman was entirely mistaken in saying that he (Mr. Norton) had authorised the expenditure of £30,000 for those buildings. He had never authorised anything of the kind. At the time the hon. member went into office, plans had been prepared for the Engineer's offices, which he refused to sanction; and other plans were in preparation. He had never authorised anything of the kind, whatever Mr. Macrossan might have done, and he was sure that gentleman could not have authorised the expenditure of that amount.

Mr. ANNEAR said he believed those new offices were to be erected at the corner of Roma street, at the gate going into the railway station. The hon. member for Fassifern last night remarked that he did not see what was the use of the excavation going on at the present time. Any person going there would see at once what the excavation was for, and they would see the use of removing the old Grammar School building, which was built on a high bank ten or twelve feet from the level of Roma street and the market house. The hon. member said last night that two retaining walls would be required. One wall might be required on the high side of the excavation, but the other side would be entirely taken away. It was a want long felt that they should have proper offices for the Railway Department. That was a beautiful site and the buildings, if erected, would be of great utility and an ornament to the city.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said they had got more information from the hon. member for Maryborough than they had got from the Minister for Works for the last three hours. He would like to hear a little more from him. Instead of addressing his questions to the Treasurer and to the Minister for Works, he would address them to the hon. member for Maryborough. That hon. member could speak more fluently, and seemed to have a great deal more knowledge of the Brisbane railway station, than the Minister for Works. Speaking to the hon. member for Maryborough, he would like to know how that £50,000 was going to be exhausted. The hon. member must remember that £175,000 had been already voted for the extension of the railway into the city. The Minister for Works, who did not know anything about it, had said that £30,000 was for the extension of the railway, and £20,000 for the Engineer's offices. What did the hon. member for Maryborough say? What plans had been prepared for the purpose of showing how the money was to be expended; in fact, what did the people generally know about it, as the Minister for Works knew nothing about it? The hon. member might give them a little more information, as he had already given them so much, and tell them how the money was going to be expended?

Mr. ANNEAR said he did not presume to be in the secrets of the hon. Minister for Works, nor did he presume to be half so competent to see the necessity of that work as the leader of the Opposition. If that gentleman went to the place for three minutes he would see at a glance the manner in which the work was to be carried out. The amount was down in the Estimates for the erection of offices for the Engineer's Department. He would not have spoken at all that night had it not been for what was said by the hon. member for Fassifern last night. The Minister for Works replied to that gentleman by saying that it was impossible to say what the offices would be like, when the work was only just commenced. However, the penetration and professional



ability of the leader of the Opposition was of a much higher standard than his (Mr. Annear's), and he had only to look at the place and see what was required. He did not have very much to say to the Minister for Works, though he had visited him two or three times with deputations, and he must say that on those occasions the hon. gentleman had been rather rough on him.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he could quite understand the hon. member not being in the secrets of the Minister for Works, for the reason that that hon. gentleman had no secrets. He knew nothing at all about the vote, and therefore he could not have a secret about it. The hon. member said that if he went up there he could see what was wanted at a glance; but he had not been there lately, and he wanted to know, before he gave his vote, how the money was to be expended; and if he could not get his information from the Minister who did not know anything about it, why should he not get it from the hon. member for Maryborough who did? The new offices for the engineers formed another piece of extravagance on the part of the Engineer-in-Chief. Not many years ago that gentleman got a comfortable and very convenient office made for himself and designed by himself, and it was a very nice piece of architecture. They thought that was going to last him for a small eternity; but they found now that he wanted new offices, and at an expense of £50,000. How much were they going to pay ultimately to house the Engineer-in-Chief? He remembered the offices of the Engineer-in-Chief in Melbourne. The Engineer-in-Chief there occupied now exactly the same offices that he occupied in 1854 and 1855 when the railways were commenced, and he found them very convenient; but their Engineer-in-Chief had been in occupation of three different offices since he could remember, and he was now asking £50,000 for another office. The hon. member for Maryborough must recognise the fact that they had a right to be curious; and so must the Minister for Works, in a milder way, because he did not take so much interest in the vote. They must recognise that it was quite possible that there should be a certain amount of curiosity as to how the money was to be expended. He was inclined to think they had better give the Engineer-in-Chief the £50,000 and let him house himself and leave them to make their own railways. Perhaps that would be the better plan to adopt. He must call upon the hon. member again, and he asked him not to be so modest—he was really in the secrets of the Ministry if not in those of the Minister for Works. Let him tell the Committee, therefore, how the vote was to be spent. What was to become of the vote? The Minister for Works knew nothing about it, and he was quite sure the hon. member for Maryborough did, and he had better give them all the information he possessed on the subject.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he had not the slightest objection to the hon. member for Mulgrave talking against time. He had explained to him already that £30,000 out of the Estimates was for the extension of the terminal station. He was surprised that the hon. member, with his large and varied experience in railway matters, could not conceive that additional accommodation should be provided. The hon. gentleman knew that very well. The balance of £20,000 was for the erection of new offices for the Railway Department.

Mr. NORTON said a very elaborate plan of an office had been drawn up by the Engineering Department. But since that time a building had been fitted up for the Engineer, and the Engineer's

staff could do their work there just as well as in a new building. The hon. gentleman had told them that he intended to pull down the old Grammar School, and might he ask whether he intended to level the whole of that hill? He noticed that the new cottage that had been put up for the messenger had been removed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the Government had no intention of cutting down that hill at the present time; but he had no doubt that in a very short time the whole of that place would be required to be levelled for the accommodation of the railway station.

Mr. NORTON asked what they wanted such a large railway station for? The traffic was not increasing so enormously as all that. He could quite understand their wanting a new goods shed and some sort of accommodation for a passenger station. Had the Engineer prepared the plans for the building?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member has seen the plans.

Mr. NORTON said he had not.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. gentleman left no records behind him; but he gave instructions that the excavations should be proceeded with for the purpose of extending the accommodation.

Mr. NORTON said he was sure he never gave instructions that the excavation should be extended to where it was now. It was proposed to carry that cutting through the very place it was now, taking in the messenger's cottage, but he would not consent to it. He never had the faintest idea of its being carried on; it was not wanted.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked how it was possible that the hon. gentleman could have given instructions of that kind. The money was never voted. What about that new street that the Government were making; was that to cost part of the £50,000—that new street from the prolongation of the station, on the eastern side of the present passenger station?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hill was being cut down out of the vote for £30,000 for the extension of the terminal station. It was found necessary to give access to the station by making a new street along the back of the station connected with Roma street.

Mr. NORTON said the Minister for Works was wrong in saying that he consented to the plans. He had heard of the new street first as a suggestion made by the Chief Engineer.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked if the plans of the new terminal station and offices had been made—if even rough plans had been drafted?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: The plans upon which the estimate had been made?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked if the hon. gentleman could not give any more particular information as to how the money was to be expended? He said there was £30,000 for an extension and £20,000 for new offices. He ought to give some particulars.

Mr. NORTON said the hon. Minister for Works was making a mistake. Plans had been prepared for the Engineer's offices, and it was proposed to erect them in Roma street; but when they were presented to him by Mr. Thorneloe Smith he told him to take them away and prepare some others. He believed that other plans had been laid before the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that he had said over and over again what that £50,000 was for. If the hon. member for Mulgrave wished to block business of course he could do so. He had explained already how that £50,000 was to be appropriated.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that was the only information that they could get after all. The only reason they could get as to why they should pass that estimate was that a portion of the money had been spent.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I am not inclined to give any more information.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. member would have to give more information before they went on. What proportion of that money had been expended?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said not a very considerable amount of the money had been expended. The proposed work was absolutely necessary to provide increased accommodation for the Traffic Department in the way of platforms, sidings, and roofing.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman seemed to forget that the Committee had already passed a vote of £175,000 for the extension of the railway into Ann street. In view of that he could not see how additional sidings and platforms could be required. It was actually proposed to increase the vote of £175,000 to £225,000, for no distinction had been made between that vote and the one already passed by the Committee.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the vote of £50,000 was required for the terminal station as far as Albert street, and the £175,000 was for the extension of the railway to the city and Fortitude Valley.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the whole of the present station had not cost £50,000, and how with an additional passenger station they would require £50,000 for the station that already existed he could not understand, nor could the Colonial Treasurer or the Minister for Works.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: You do not want to understand it.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he would like to understand it, but he could not get a ray of intelligence from Ministers.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the CHAIRMAN left the chair, reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again at a later hour of the day.

#### CROWN LANDS BILL.—MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received the following message from the Legislative Council:—

“Legislative Council Chamber,  
“Brisbane, 15th December, 1884.

“MR. SPEAKER,

“The Legislative Council, having taken into consideration the report of the managers on their behalf on the Free Conference with the Legislative Assembly relative to their amendments in the Crown Lands Bill, which were disagreed to by the Assembly and insisted on by the Council, beg now to intimate that they—

“Insist on their amendments in clause 1, clause 4, lines 14 and 39, on the omission of clauses 75 to 79, inclusive, and on their amendments in clauses 121 and 139 for the reasons already urged.

“Insist on their amendments in clauses 6 and 7 for the reasons already urged.

“Do not insist on their amendment in clause 20, except the omission of the last line of the clause.

“Agree to the insertion of the following new clause to follow clause 20:—

“21. Any person aggrieved by a decision of the board, whether on an original hearing or on a rehearing,

1884—6 z

may within one month after the pronouncing of the decision or of the refusal of the Governor in Council to remit the matter to the board, as the case may be, appeal from the decision to the Supreme Court, which is hereby authorised to hear and determine such appeal.

“The appeal shall be in the nature of a rehearing, and shall be brought, and the proceedings therein shall be had, in such manner as may be prescribed by Rules of Court.

“The appeal shall be heard and determined by a single judge, but the judge shall, if required by either party to the appeal, call in the aid of two assessors specially qualified, and shall hear and determine the matter with the assistance of such assessors.

“One assessor shall be nominated by each party, but such nomination shall be subject to the approval of the judge.

“Evidence on an appeal to the court may be taken in the same manner as is hereinbefore prescribed in the case of matters heard and determined by the board.

“An appeal shall lie to the Full Court from any decision of the judge upon a question of law.”

“And the following new clause to follow clause 110:—

“No appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court from a decision of the board determining the amount of compensation payable to a pastoral tenant or a lessee under this part of this Act.”

“Insist on their amendments in clause 21, and subsection 8 of clause 27.

Insist on their amendment in subsection 1 of clause 28, for the reasons already urged.

“Insist on their amendments in clause 43, in the second paragraph of clause 51, and the first paragraph of clause 70, for the reasons already urged.

“Agree to the omission of clause (f) of subsection 4 of clause 56.

“And do not insist on their amendments in clause 71, to which the Legislative Assembly disagreed.

“A. H. PALMER,  
“President.”

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that the message be taken into consideration at a later hour of the day.

Question put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The COLONIAL TREASURER, in moving the adjournment of the House, said the Government desired to take into consideration the Legislative Council's message the first thing to-day.

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