

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**TUESDAY, 19 OCTOBER 1886**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 19 October, 1886.

Formal Motions.—Normanton to Cloncurry Railway.—Message from the Legislative Council—Divisional Boards Bill No. 2.—Ruling of the Speaker.—British Companies Bill.—Northern Railway Deviation.—Fassifern Branch Deviation.—Fortitude Valley Extension.—Adjournment—Chairman's casting vote.

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

## FORMAL MOTIONS.

The following formal motions were agreed to:—

By Mr. BUCKLAND—

That so much of the papers as refers to the resumption for water on the Galloway Plains Run, Port Curtis district, laid on the table of the House on Tuesday last, the 12th instant, be printed.

By Mr. SALKELD—

That there be laid on the table of the House, a return showing the expenditure on the Southern and Western Railway in each of the three departments—viz., Locomotive, Traffic, and Engineer's (maintenance)—for the nine months ending 30th September, 1886; and the probable expenditure for the three months ending 31st December, 1886.

## NORMANTON TO CLONCURRY RAILWAY.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Miles) said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that you do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions, namely:—

1. That the House approves of the plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed line of railway from Normanton towards Cloncurry, 0 miles to 38 miles, in length 38 miles, as laid upon the table of the House on Tuesday, the 12th day of October instant.

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

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS, in moving—

1. That the House approves of the plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed line of railway from Normanton towards Cloncurry, 0 miles to 38 miles, in length 38 miles, as laid upon the table of the House on Tuesday, the 12th day of October instant.

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

—said he regretted that he was unable to give hon. members much information from his own experience, as that was a railway that he had not personally inspected and gone over. The Government, however, had fortified themselves with the very best information at their command, and he strongly recommended hon. members to read the report made by Mr. Hannam, who had inspected that country and reported upon the route the railway should take. He thought they would be able to get sufficient information in that report, because it was accompanied with a tracing of the railway from Normanton to Cloncurry, which would assist them very considerably in coming to a conclusion as to the necessity and desirability of that railway. Before proceeding to select a route for the line to the Cloncurry it was desirable to find a port, and Mr. Cullen was despatched to survey the whole of the Gulf rivers, and ascertain which was the most suitable for the establishment of a port for the railway. There would be found in Mr. Hannam's report extracts from a report by Mr. Cullen, wherein he observed that the Norman River was the river, and the only river, for the establishment of a port on the Gulf waters; therefore the Government had satisfied them-

selves in the first instance, before they gave instructions about the survey of the railway, that they had secured a suitable port for that locality. Mr. Hannam reported very favourably on the line, which would be almost entirely of surface construction. There were no heavy works on it, and the ruling gradient on it was 1 in 66, with the exception of a few chains in length at the approach to the Flinders River, where the gradient would be 1 in 44, though whether it would be affected by a low-level bridge or not he did not know. It was a short line, thirty-eight miles in length, and the ruling gradient, as he had said, was 1 in 66, with the exception of a few chains approaching the Flinders River. As to bridging, there would be 600 feet of bridges and 400 feet of culverts or small waterways, and timber and ballast were scarce. As he had said, the line would be almost entirely of surface formation, and there would be only about 14,000 cubic yards of excavation.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: On the whole section?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Fourteen thousand cubic yards of excavation; and the whole of the bridging was 600 feet. The estimated cost of the line was £2,400 per mile. Hon. members would see by the plans that it was about one of the easiest lines to be constructed. In fact, there was no line by which the interior of the country could be approached from the coast so easily as by the line before them. Mr. Cullen, according to his survey, made a rise of twelve feet per mile, but Mr. Hannam did not make it so much as that; he made a rise towards the interior of the country of eight feet per mile. The rise was gradual, and there was no main range to pass. It was really the easiest line of approach to the interior of the country from the coast of any line under construction, or that had been constructed in this or in any of the colonies. He was unable to say very much of the country which it went through, but Mr. Hannam had described it, if hon. members would read his report; and, above all, it extended in the direction of what he supposed was about the richest mineral country in any portion of Queensland. It was not necessary that he should dwell at any length upon the desirability and necessity of the construction of that railway. He had not the slightest doubt the hon. member for Mackay would get up by-and-by and blame the Government for having been tardy, and for not having pushed on the line much sooner than they had done, and he would probably also complain that the section was not long enough. He was quite sure the hon. member would find some fault with it, but the object the Government had in view in the first instance was to ascertain where they could secure the best port on the Gulf waters, and it had therefore been necessary to make a thorough survey of the whole of the rivers on the Gulf before coming to a conclusion as to where they would carry the line. Before sitting down he would add that his hon. friends the Chief Secretary and the Colonial Treasurer had paid a visit to the Normanton and the Gulf country, in order to ascertain the requirements of that part of the colony; and he had no doubt that they would be able to supply any information hon. members might want, which he (the Minister for Works) might have omitted.

Mr. PALMER said he thought he could safely congratulate the Minister for Works upon at last having brought forward a railway which he could conscientiously recommend. He was also glad to hear the Minister for Works refer hon. members to the Chief Secretary and the Colonial Treasurer for further information on the subject;

but if any information should be wanting, he (Mr. Palmer) would be very glad to assist those hon. gentlemen, as he was well acquainted with the district. In the first place he could bear out what the Minister for Works had said with regard to the River Norman being the proper place from which the railway should start. Every means had been taken to discover which was the best port in the Gulf of Carpentaria, and the reports of the surveyors and engineers were all recorded in the "Votes and Proceedings": they had them even up to last year. Mr. Cullen's report bore out all the previous statements that there was no river in the Gulf—no river even in Queensland—that could compare with the Norman River in its capabilities as a shipping port. The depth of water in the river, and its width, proved it beyond any doubt to be the most reliable port for any large railway to start from. There was one part of the plan to which he might be inclined to take exception, where the reports of the surveyors were not followed, and that was the starting point from the river. Captain Heath had sent in a report, which was laid on the table within the last few days, dated the 24th September, 1886, in which he confirmed the reports of the previous surveyors and engineers as to the tortuousness of the upper part of the Norman River, and the desirability that the railway should start from some point on the river where deep water would connect the railway with large shipping. After referring to the tortuousness of the Albert River, he went on to say:—

"The Norman is not much better in this respect, as in one place you travel seven miles along the river and then find you are only a quarter of a mile ahead. In the third reach from the mouth of the Albert the ground on the west shore is well above high-water mark, and any communication between Burketown and the sea should be to this spot. Indeed, it would be wise in both these rivers for the present (if it is intended to dredge a channel for large vessels across the bar), to ignore the upper part, as requiring expensive improvements, and to concentrate every effort in communicating with Normanton by railway or tramway from the Red Bluff."

It was about eighteen miles from the mouth of the river up to that point; and if the bar were dredged any steamer visiting Queensland at the present time could lie alongside the banks there. That was a very important matter in the construction of such a railway—that it should go direct from where ocean-going steamers could lie alongside the bank. He saw by the plans that the tramway or railway started from a point near the township. That might probably suit present requirements; but as the trade increased, as it was sure to do to a very large extent, it would be desirable to have the line carried down to where ocean-going steamers could ship their cargo straight away. It was a matter of 10s. a ton in freightage, and that was a great lot on 8,000 or 10,000 tons which were likely to be shipped annually from there soon. Apart from that, he did not think there had ever been a railway projected in Australia on the same conditions as that one—starting from a navigable river, traversing level country straight away from the shipping port, going through the best pastoral country and the finest mineral country in Australia, and having for its terminus probably other shipping ports. Although the present Government could not be said to be the projectors of that railway, still they were to be congratulated for bringing it to that point. Mr. Hannam's report was, he was certain, quite reliable. Mr. Hannam had been over the country, and from his (Mr. Palmer's) knowledge of the country he believed the route laid down by Mr. Hannam was the best that could be devised for such a railway. No route could have been found freer from floods or traversing safer

country, always taking into account the distance to be traversed. So level was the country that were it not for the crossing of the rivers the line might be struck out anywhere from the Norman River. As to the gradient of 1 in 44 referred to by the Minister for Works, seeing that it was for such a short distance—merely going down the bank of the Flinders and up again—it would be well, if possible, to alter it. It would not be advisable, on such a length of railway where the surface was so even, to make the haulage difficult at one point just for the sake of a very short stage, and he thought that difficulty should be endeavoured to be overcome. The matter before the Minister for Works now was to endeavour to carry out that line with as much despatch as possible, considering that it could be laid with such speed and at such a cheap rate. He considered that that railway was bound to connect the two oceans—the Indian and the South Pacific—and it should never be relinquished until it was connected with Brisbane itself and all the coast towns—Townsville in the first instance, Rockhampton in the next, and Brisbane next—so as to make the line a transcontinental railway. He saw that the South Australians were pushing their railways on from Port Augusta and Port Darwin, and inasmuch as they had much heavier difficulties to contend against, Queensland should see that this railway was carried out as quickly as possible. He believed that if after the first section was begun tenders were called for the rest of the line, contractors from home would tender for the whole lot. The line bore some resemblance to one or two others that he knew of. Take, for instance, the Canadian Railway, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a line of 2,500 miles in length, which was constructed in five years. That speed had never been attained in these colonies yet, but there was really no reason why it should not be. The contractors for that line had four and a-half years longer in which to construct it, but such was the enterprise of the people that it was constructed in the remarkable time of five years.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That was a land-grant railway.

Mr. PALMER said he believed it was. He believed in land-grant railways himself, and thought the time would come when mostly all railways would be constructed on that principle.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not on the basis proposed here.

Mr. PALMER said whatever system was adopted in carrying out that line, speed in its construction, at all events, should be taken into consideration. On that afternoon he had received a letter saying that two vessels were loading from Great Britain for Normanton with the rails and fastenings for twenty-five miles of the line, which showed that the Government really had at heart the intention of starting at once. He did not think the Minister for Works said anything else that needed reply; but if any hon. member required any further information he should be happy to give it after the Chief Secretary and Colonial Treasurer had spoken.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Government were to be congratulated upon having brought that railway forward as soon as they had done, but, in spite of what the hon. member for Burke had said, he was satisfied from what he had seen of Mr. Hannam's report that the best port had been selected. But it was far from being a good port. There was a recommendation made in Mr. Hannam's report that a large area for railway purposes should be gazetted in what was known as the Red Bluff, and he would like to know if that had been done.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS :** It is being attended to.

**THE HON. J. M. MACROSSAN** said he was glad to hear it, because it was more than likely that the large ships spoken of as likely to come to Normanton would find great difficulty in going there, and the sooner there was communication to the sea the better. He said that, not in the interests of Normanton, but of the whole colony, because he looked upon the line as being the northern end of the line which would ultimately connect the whole colony with the Gulf, and, he thought, for that reason the Government were to be congratulated upon having brought it forward. He could not, however, understand the estimated cost of the line. The Minister for Works told them that in the whole section there were only 14,000 cubic yards of earthwork. Now, a man who understood anything at all about railway construction knew that it was the earthworks that cost the money, and 14,000 cubic yards of earthworks in thirty-eight miles was actually less than 500 yards per mile. He, therefore, supposed that it was simply formation, because if earthwork was under a foot it was reckoned as formation.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS :** It is the engineer's estimate—I did not survey the line.

**THE HON. J. M. MACROSSAN** said he had no doubt about that. He was certain the hon. gentleman had given them the engineer's estimate, but he could not possibly understand how the cost of £2,400 a mile came in. If there was so little earthwork, how could it cost so much? The cost of the rails or rolling-stock was not included, but the £2,400 per mile was simply for construction. He thought the estimate must be a mistake—a very serious mistake; and even taking the cost at £2,400 per mile, the amount of money voted would not be sufficient to cover the cost of constructing 235 miles. They would be £100,000 short. There was to be no fencing, certainly, which would reduce the cost; the cost was simply for the bare forming of the line and laying the road. Well, he thought the Minister for Works ought to make the Chief Engineer reconsider and revise his estimate, because the line ought not to cost that much. Why, they were making railways as cheap as that where there were earthworks and where a considerable amount of ballast was used. Much more ballast was used in the South than the North. The Minister for Works knew that, and altogether he (Mr. Macrossan) was at a loss to understand where the cost came in. The Minister for Works must see for himself that there was a mistake. Why, in one cutting on some of the lines there was more than 14,000 yards of earthwork, and he had seen instances lately where five or six times as much had been taken out. However, he was very glad that the Committee was asked to approve of the plans and sections of the line, and hoped that tenders would be called for soon, because it was no use passing the plans if tenders were not to be called for. He would like to ask the Minister for Works when he thought he would be able to call for tenders. It ought not to take long to prepare the working plans.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS** said the Government could not be charged with delay in pushing on the railways. He would have invited tenders long ago if the plans had been ready so as to be prepared to go to work as soon as the line was approved. Now, the hon. member for Townsville was always harping about lines being made for this and that sum per mile, but he thought the country was pretty well satisfied about the hon. member's construction of railways, at all events. The present Government had been doing nothing

since they came into office but remedying the blunders the hon. member committed. He should have to ask the House to consent to a deviation of the Fassifern branch line, on which it was a matter of surprise that some serious accident had not long ago taken place. Then, with regard to the Sandgate line, the present Government had had to almost rebuild it. And now the hon. member got up and wanted to know why the Normanton line could not be built at such and such a price! He was surprised at the hon. member. But the present estimate, as the hon. member must know very well, was merely based on the parliamentary survey; the Chief Engineer could not possibly state the exact amount of excavation required until the permanent survey was made. If the line could be built for £2,400 a mile, including bridges, it would not be a very costly line. It should above all be built in a substantial manner, so that it could carry traffic when completed.

**THE HON. J. M. MACROSSAN** said that, as they had a great deal of work to do that evening, he hoped the Chief Secretary would put a curb on the tongue of the Minister for Works. If the hon. gentleman commenced the business of the evening by making attacks upon him simply because he was doing his duty as a member of the House, he might expect something in return. However, he would pass over what the hon. gentleman had just said; it had nothing whatever to do with the question before them. The Minister for Works stated the requirements of the line to be 14,000 yards of earthwork, 600 feet of bridging, and 400 feet of culverts. Any practical man who knew anything about the cost of making a line—leaving the Fassifern and Sandgate lines out of the question—could make an estimate of his own as to what that work would cost—the work consisting mainly of ballast and sleepers. When would the hon. gentleman be able to call for tenders for that railway?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS :** As soon as the permanent survey is completed.

**THE HON. J. M. MACROSSAN** said the hon. gentleman meant when the working plans were completed. But it need not take very long to make the working plans for a line of that description, where the work was so very slight. Some of the engineers they had lately lost would have made them in a fortnight.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith)** said that, as his hon. colleague had stated, no detailed particulars could yet be given as to the £2,400. He (the Premier) supposed the amount was fixed so apparently high on account of the scarcity of timber and ballast in the locality. If the line was made in the usual way, with wooden sleepers and the ordinary ballast, the estimate would not be excessive. But he anticipated that by the substitution of steel sleepers for timber the cost would be reduced, though not perhaps very materially even then. He was not prepared to say that in any case the line would cost less than £2,400 a mile, but he certainly hoped so; and if the entire line could be made at that rate it would not be a dear one.

**THE HON. J. M. MACROSSAN** said the quantity of ballast used on the Northern lines was 500 yards per mile, and 525 yards was what Mr. Ballard had been in the habit of using. Taking the cost at 6s. 8d. per yard—a very high price—it would amount to under £180 per mile.

**MR. LUMLEY HILL** said the amount of ballast on the Northern lines—550 yards to the mile—had been found quite insufficient, and it had had to be made up to something like 1,200 yards to the mile.

Mr. PALMER said that if steel sleepers were to be used upon the proposed line it would do away with the necessity for much ballast, as they would be laid on the surface formation alone, leaving the top of the ground pretty much as nature made it. Whatever ballast was required, they would not want to use broken stone, but sand or pebbles, and that could be obtained on some of the ridges out there in any quantity close to the line. With regard to timber, he could bear out what Mr. Hannam had said in his report, and was of opinion that there would be very little timber found even for bridges. He did not suppose they would get sufficient even for the few bridges that were required. The station he held out there was about the best timbered station in the district, and they had to go sixteen or eighteen miles to get 10,000 or 12,000 feet of gum, the sawing of which cost £2 per 100. Indeed, he was of opinion that they would have to depend a good deal upon iron for bridges as well as for sleepers.

Mr. ANNEAR asked whether the estimate of £2,400 per mile included the permanent way?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No.

Mr. ANNEAR said that in that case the line could be built for less than £2,400 a mile. Taking 2,500 sleepers per mile at £30 per 100, £750; laying permanent way, 1,760 yards, £250; formation of 80 chains, £160; earthworks, £75; box drains and bridges, £400; and ballasting, £400; making a total of £2,135 per mile. The work could be done for that sum provided that iron-bark sleepers were used. Hon. members seemed to think that iron sleepers could be simply laid on the surface of the ground, and a remark to that effect was made the other day by the Premier. But that was a mistake. The formation would consist of newly made earth, and the iron sleepers laid upon that would naturally go into the ground. It would be found in the end that the steel sleepers, as patented by Mr. Phillips, would be far more costly than hardwood sleepers, which could be procured in the colony. Exclusive of permanent way, and by using hardwood sleepers, the line could, in his opinion, be made for £2,135 per mile.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN asked whether it was intended to use steel sleepers on the Normanton line?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied that Mr. Phillips had now completed his design for the sleepers, and he intended to call for tenders for a small quantity to test them before they were laid on the Normanton line. The Government were under the impression that the branch line to Laidley Creek would be a very good place for testing the sleepers, and if the test was successful they would be adopted all over the line under discussion. He might inform hon. gentlemen that the permanent survey had been completed for some time, and the engineer who surveyed it was now preparing plans and drawings, and tenders would be invited within a very short time.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Have the Government considered that the laying down of these sleepers on the Laidley branch line will tend to delay the construction of the other line?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not think so.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Committee were only to be asked that afternoon to pass the plans and sections of the Laidley branch line.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: For the purpose of testing them.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said they might expect that the working plans of the line would be ready in three months; but in calling for tenders the Government must say what sort of sleepers they intended to use—whether they expected the contractor to find wooden sleepers, or whether they would find steel sleepers themselves. It would lead to delay if the experiment were to be tried upon the Laidley branch. The experiment should be tried at once, immediately.

The PREMIER said the experiment must be made somewhere. The hon. gentleman wanted the Government to go on as if the experiment had been tried and proved successful. The experiment could not be tried until the sleepers had been made, and the laying down would only take two or three months. Was it not worth while if the experiment proved successful, in order to save an enormous amount in the cost of construction of the line and in the cost of maintenance and an immense time in construction, to wait one month or two, or even three months? He thought it was. It need not be much more. He believed tenders would be called for the sleepers in a few days, and he thought they could be made in Brisbane. If the test was successful they would be able to lay the line at about four times the ordinary rate of making railways. It would simply be laid straight on end; and would it not be worth while to lose two or three months in commencing the construction for the purpose of gaining two or three years in completing it? It was no use rushing into an experiment on a line thirty-eight miles in length, when it might be a failure. But it was worth while to try it on a small scale, and if it were successful they could adopt it on a large scale. And as the line would not begin to pay much until it was finished, speed in construction was a matter of very great consideration.

Mr. NORTON said the point the hon. member for Townsville referred to was the time that would be taken in testing the new sleepers upon the Laidley Creek railway. The plans of that line had not been passed, and the design for the sleepers was not complete.

The PREMIER: Yes, it is.

Mr. NORTON said they were told by the Minister for Works that it was not completed. There must be a delay if the Laidley Creek branch were selected to test the sleepers.

The PREMIER: Or any other line.

Mr. NORTON said there would be some delay before the Laidley Creek branch could be commenced: so that there would be a considerable delay in regard to the line under discussion. Could not the sleepers be tested upon some line now being built? A few miles would be sufficient for every purpose, and in a very short time the Government would be able to judge whether the sleepers would answer the purpose as well as they expected.

The PREMIER: What other line would you suggest?

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Some line where the rails are now being laid.

The PREMIER: It would have to be on a line over the same class of country.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Any country in the West would do.

Mr. NORTON said any black-soil country would do to try the experiment. If they were tried on black soil there could be no objection to go on with the line before the Committee.

The PREMIER said the sleepers would not do on ordinary country. They would have to try them on similar country to that in the Gulf,

and he understood that the Laidley Valley was similar—black soil. He did not know whether there was any country of the same nature between Dulbydilla and Charleville, and he doubted whether it would be convenient to try it so far away as Barcardine. But that was entirely a matter of detail. What they wanted to do was to get a place where the experiment could be tried with expedition.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said if the experiment were tried upon the Laidley Creek branch it could not be completed for eighteen months instead of three months. The hon. gentleman forgot that the line must be made and the rolling-stock upon it for a few months before it could be properly tested. That was the point that the hon. member had overlooked. It should be tried upon one of the lines they were at present laying. The test should be made so as not to delay the construction of the Cloncurry line. There was the Northern line to Hughenden.

The PREMIER: That is not far enough in advance.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: What about the line to Beauraba? They did not require exactly a similar soil. There was wanted a general similarity only; no matter whether the soil were black, or red, or white. If the nature of the soil were friable and loose, that was what they wanted. He believed that in the North the whole of the soil was alike so far as that was concerned.

Mr. BLACK said he was very glad the Government had done something towards getting on with the line. But from the explanation they had now received, it seemed that the commencement of that line was to be dependent upon the success of steel sleepers upon the Laidley line, as the Laidley line would pass over similar soil to that in the Gulf country. That was a most unexpected revelation to him. The Gulf country was sandy, and country in which the white ant was excessively prevalent owing to its characteristics. He always understood that the Laidley line was going through an agricultural district.

The PREMIER: The Gulf country is not sandy.

Mr. BLACK said it amounted to this: that if the commencement of the Gulf line was to be dependent upon a trial on the Laidley line, a line they had not even passed yet—giving the Government credit for the best intentions in carrying out that railway—it would certainly be eighteen months, if not two years, before the trial could be completed. It was just as well to understand, especially in the North, that the commencement of the Gulf line would, in all probability, be delayed for two years from the present time, in order to give the Government an opportunity of making the experiment on the Laidley line. Suppose they did not pass the Laidley line, what then?

Mr. STEVENSON: Supposing the experiment there is not a success?

The PREMIER: Then try it somewhere else.

Mr. BLACK said he would be very glad if the hon. gentleman would try it somewhere else. It seemed unreasonable to state that it should be tried on the Laidley Creek line, when they all knew—at least, he had reason to believe—that the character of the soil there was altogether different from the Gulf country. The Minister for Works quite unnecessarily said he supposed the hon. member for Mackay would blame the Government for not carrying on the line before. He (Mr. Black) accepted the hon. member's challenge. He did blame the Government. It was a line for which

£500,000 was voted two years ago, and which passed over country where railway construction was of such an easy description. And after all thirty-eight miles was a ridiculously small distance to make. They might as well have made seventy miles while they were about it. But taking that short distance, only thirty-eight miles, and that not going to deep water at the Gulf, with the new revelation that the commencement even of that was to be dependent upon the construction of a line which was not voted, it seemed to be at least possible that it would not be commenced for two years from the present time. He thought the North would construct their own railways before that.

The PREMIER said he had expected that the hon. member for Mackay would make another grievance for the North out of this railway, and he was wondering how he would manage to do it. Really the burden of all the hon. member's speeches was the grievances of the North. This was another injury to the North—that the Cloncurry line was dependent on the Laidley line! But nobody had said it was dependent on the Laidley line. They all knew, with regard to the construction of this line in the North, that the Government were anxious to push it on—quite as anxious as the hon. member for Mackay, who objected to the Government going on with an experiment which they believed, whilst causing a short delay, would eventually save a great deal of time and a great deal of money. When the Government was asked by an hon. member where the experiment was to be tried, and the Minister for Works informed him it was proposed to try it at Laidley Creek, where the soil was similar, the hon. member for Mackay said, "Here is another injustice to the North; the Government want to try an experiment which will delay the Northern line for two years." He (the Premier) really wished that the hon. members for the North would address themselves to business in a business-like way. It was not the way to get justice for the North or any other part of the colony, to endeavour continually to stir up strife and war with members for other parts of the colony.

Mr. PALMER said he hoped the Minister for Works would carry out the experiment upon conditions as close as he possibly could to those under which the Cloncurry line would be laid.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. PALMER said if the experiment were conducted under the supervision of Mr. Phillips, he thought, from that gentleman's knowledge of the country and soil up there, and his general intelligence connected with all matters of railway engineering and supervision, that if he was satisfied with the conditions, they might rest satisfied it would be a success. He (Mr. Palmer) had always understood that this line would be a great deal cheaper than the Minister for Works had stated that evening. He had heard him say that people would offer to undertake the contract for less than £2,100 a mile the whole distance. He hoped the conditions under which the experiment would be tried would be similar to the Gulf country, as it might prove a failure, and necessitate sleepers being carried out there.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he had known Mr. Phillips for a great many years and had marked his career, especially when in office, and he quite agreed with the hon. member for Burke that this experiment to be successful should be more or less under Mr. Phillips's supervision when being carried out. But there was no necessity for the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government talking about there being any ill-feeling between the North and the South.

The PREMIER: Yes, there was.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that the hon. member for Mackay was only aiding in trying to get the Government to see the mistake that would be made if they intended to make the test at the Laidley branch, for it would take twelve or eighteen months, or at any rate not less than fifteen months, before that branch was constructed. Now, there was the Northern line, where they were laying down rails, and why could not those sleepers be tried there. Of course, it was not sufficient to lay the sleepers down; they must be run on for months before they could be proved; and the sooner they were laid down the sooner the experiment would be proved to be a success, which he believed it would be. That was his object in saying what he did say. He had no intention to say a word about injustice to the North, and he was certain the hon. member for Mackay had no intention to raise ill-feeling.

Mr. McWHANNELL said he thought there could be no difficulty in finding a place to conduct the experiment, seeing the Central line and the Northern line were being constructed over black-soil downs very much similar to the country on the Gulf watershed. He was very glad to hear the remarks of the Premier that if those sleepers were found to be a success this line would be constructed at a much more rapid rate than any hitherto constructed. He would point out that it would be greatly in the interest not only of individuals in the colony, but of the revenue and the commerce of the whole country, that the line should be constructed as rapidly as possible. Hon. members would concur in that statement when he pointed out that in the western part of the colony there was an immense amount of traffic carried on with South Australia, nearly the whole of which traffic would go to the Gulf if the railway were opened. The Customs revenue during the year 1884-5 collected on the South Australian border amounted to £3,597, and for the six months ending 30th June last the amount was £3,253, so that there was an immense amount of traffic that now went to South Australia which would almost entirely go to the Gulf. The whole of that commerce would be saved to this colony. He would also point out that there was an immense tract of available grazing country in that district, and settlers in that part of the country were only awaiting railway communication to improve that country and stock it up with sheep. And he predicted that at no distant day—if they found that railway was to be constructed rapidly—the country, not only in the Burke district but also in the North Gregory, would be largely stocked with sheep. He had not the slightest doubt that the proposed railway would be one of the best paying lines in the country.

Mr. HAMILTON said there was no doubt that if the Cloncurry line was deferred until the experiment of steel sleepers had been tried on the Laidley branch a very unnecessary delay would be caused. The plans of the Laidley line had not yet been passed, and the permanent survey would have to be made before tenders were called and the contract entered into. Before that occurred they would have to wait fifteen months at the least before the experiment could be carried out. Hon. members had expressed the opinion that it was inadvisable that such delay should be occasioned, and had suggested that that delay could be obviated by making the experiment on some other lines. One of those lines on which it might be made was the first section of the Cairns-Herberton railway. About eight miles in length were now under construction, and several miles of that section were of a soil similar in character to that

which it was desirable to experiment upon. It was black soil, and the experiment could be made there at once.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he would point out to the hon. member for Townsville that he believed the branch now being built at Beauraba would be very suitable for trying the experiment. It was a surface line, and he presumed that the surface, no matter what the soil was, would be suitable for testing. That could be done there almost at once; as soon as the sleepers were available they could be laid down and tested. There was no occasion to be alarmed at all at delay. He was under the impression that some hon. members were annoyed that the Government had pushed on this line at once. They had placed it at the head of the list, and he believed that was what annoyed hon. members opposite. They would have liked it to have been put last, and to have been able to say, "Oh, another injury to the North!" That was what annoyed them; but the Government had determined to do justice to the North in spite of them.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that those on his side who were anxious that justice should be done to the North would not be provoked by the Government putting the Cloncurry line at the head of the list. However, the statement just made by the Minister for Works was satisfactory. The test could be made on the Beauraba line. It was a line on which it could be made at once, and the line being in the South, the test could be made under the supervision of the Minister.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported the resolution to the House, and the resolution was adopted.

## MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

### DIVISIONAL BOARDS BILL.

The SPEAKER said: I have to report that I have received the following message from the Legislative Council:—

"Mr. SPEAKER,

"The Legislative Council have this day agreed to a Bill entitled 'A Bill to consolidate and amend the laws relating to local government outside the boundaries of municipalities,' with the amendments indicated by the accompanying schedule, in which amendments they invite the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly.

"JOHN F. McDOUGALL,

"Presiding Chairman.

"Legislative Council Chamber,

"19th October, 1886."

### RULING OF THE SPEAKER.

The SPEAKER said: It is my duty to call the attention of the House to the fact that amendments have been made in this Bill which again interfere with the privileges and claims this House has always asserted in dealing with Bills of this character. It will be in the recollection of hon. members that in 1879, when the Divisional Boards Bill was passed, amendments were made by the Upper Chamber in the 159th clause, which was the clause specially dealing with rating. The amendments then consisted of striking out from the list of properties exempted from the payment of rates the word "orphanages," and further, the omission of the words "no rateable property," and the insertion in lieu thereof of the following words—

namely, "in ascertaining the fair annual value of any land regard shall be had to the quality thereof, and the tenure upon which it is held." In the same clause the following proviso was also added :—

"Provided further that in case of country land the capital value shall, apart from any valuation which may be put on any houses or buildings thereon, be estimated at the fair average capital value of unimproved lands of the same quality in the neighbourhood."

Those amendments were brought under the notice of the House by the then Premier—Mr., now Sir Thomas, McIlwraith—and the House unanimously refused to assent to them or to allow any interference whatever to take place on the part of the Upper Chamber in connection with the rating clause. I may inform the House that the practice of the House of Commons has invariably been never to allow any interference on the part of the Lords with Bills such as those relating to local government, and I will give just one case in illustration to satisfy the House on that point. On the 7th August, 1839—the Right Hon. Charles Shaw-Lefevre being Speaker—the Municipal Corporations (Ireland) Bill was received, with amendments, from the Lords, and the Premier, Lord John Russell, drew the attention of the Speaker to certain amendments made by the Lords, and asked his ruling as to whether they were not an interference with the privileges of the House of Commons; and the Speaker replied in the following words :—

"If he correctly understood the question, it had reference to those clauses in the Bill which transferred certain powers of taxation held under the existing law by the grand juries of the several counties in Ireland to the newly created councils in the proposed municipal boroughs, the Lords' amendment upon which he did not think the House of Commons could agree to. It had always been most jealous of any interference on the part of the other House in cases of this description. It did not even allow the House of Lords to change the name of a single trustee in a turnpike Bill. If a Bill passed the Commons for the collection of rates, it never consented, and never would consent, to any alteration being made by the other House respecting the body which was to have the control of those rates. He apprehended, therefore, that the Commons having decided that those powers of taxation were hereafter to be exercised by the new municipal councils, and the House of Lords having so amended the Bill as to re-transfer those powers to the grand juries of the counties in Ireland, that the House of Commons could not, consistently with the proper maintenance of its privileges, agree to that amendment."

The amendment was disagreed to by the House of Commons and the Lords acquiesced in their disagreement. I may also inform the House that in 1854 a similar decision was given by the same Speaker on a similar Bill; on the 27th July, 1849, a similar decision was given by the Speaker; and on the 31st May, 1847, a similar decision was given by the same Speaker. So that, as far as the practice of the House of Commons is concerned, it has invariably been that no interference whatever is allowed with Bills of this description. I do not think I shall be exceeding my duty as Speaker of this Assembly if I say that I think, after the decision given by the Privy Council recently with regard to amendments made by the Legislative Council in money and taxation Bills, that their action now is extremely to be regretted. The opinion of the Privy Council was given at the joint request of both Houses; and to amend Bills in the way the Divisional Boards Bill has been amended, in the face of that authoritative opinion, is calculated to create unnecessary friction between the two branches of the Legislature. To facilitate public business it is of the greatest importance that harmony should exist and be promoted between the two Houses; but to amend Bills which it is the exclusive right of this Chamber to deal with is not calculated either to facilitate

the public business or promote harmony and good feeling. The amendments made in this Bill are of such a character that the House cannot on any consideration assent to them.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I think the House is indebted to you for your observations respecting the amendments made by the Council in the Bill. I am loth to think that such amendments were made deliberately by the majority of the members of that Chamber; I am disposed to think that it may turn out on inquiry that they have been made by an accidental majority, consisting of a few members. We shall know whether that is so or not when we have the facts before us. I do not propose to lay the Bill aside—it is a matter of too great importance for that—and I therefore move that the message of the Legislative Council be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

#### BRITISH COMPANIES BILL.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—In pursuance of a resolution adopted in Committee of the Whole, I beg to present a Bill to amend and declare the law of Queensland with respect to joint-stock companies incorporated in other parts of Her Majesty's dominions, and I move that it be read a first time.

Question put and passed, and the second reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

#### NORTHERN RAILWAY DEVIATION.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move—

That the Speaker do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions, namely :—

1. That the House approves of the plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed deviation of the Northern Railway into Hughenden, in length about two miles, as laid upon the table of the House on Tuesday, the 12th day of October instant.

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

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS, in moving—

1. That the House approves of the plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed deviation of the Northern Railway into Hughenden, in length about two miles, as laid upon the table of the House on Tuesday, the 12th day of October instant.

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

—said he would point out to hon. members that it had been found desirable to make the slight deviation proposed, so as to bring the railway into the town of Hughenden. By the original survey the line would pass about a mile and a-half outside the township. That was considered the best route to take on account of the flooded nature of the country. However, the inhabitants of Hughenden had asked for a deviation to bring the line into the town. The route of the proposed deviation did not form a very nice bend, but it was free from flood, and brought the railway sufficiently near to the centre of the town. He saw the hon. member for Townsville was pointing out the bend on the plan, but it was the only way the difficulty could be overcome; and he might say it was some considerable time before he could be got to consent to what he called a "horse-shoe bend"; but it was found that there was no other way of approaching the township of Hughenden unless they constructed a branch line, and, as a matter of fact, the deviation was not confirmed until after the Premier and Colonial Treasurer had visited Hughenden while they were out on the Gulf



country. It did appear a very awkward bend, but it was found to be the most suitable way of reaching the township. The hon. member for Burke would be able to give the Committee a good deal of information on the proposed deviation, because that hon. member had interviewed him before he would consent to the deviation. He was quite sure the hon. member knew the country a good deal better than he did himself, and he believed the hon. member would be able to satisfy the Committee upon the necessity for the proposed deviation. He would point out that it would involve no additional cost on the original line, because the contractors were prevented from doing any work on that portion of the line beyond where the deviation took place.

Mr. PALMER said the Minister for Works was correct in saying that there had been a good deal of correspondence over that deviation. It had extended over last year, and many times during the present year he had waited on the hon. gentleman in connection with the matter. A great deal of feeling had been raised in the township of Hughenden over carrying the railway two miles outside the town. They were a good deal in the hands of the engineers in the matter. He was not competent to say whether the way proposed was the correct way in which to make the deviation, supposing that it was right and proper that the railway should go through the town—as he held it should. He was under the impression that the line could be brought nearer the river without necessitating the extraordinary curve which looked so peculiar on the map. It was right that the railway should go as close to the town as possible, as the people had bought allotments and settled on the bank of the river, where the only good water was to be had; and if the terminus had been constructed two miles out, as was proposed, it would have been necessary to shift the township out towards the railway, which would have been scarcely fair to those people who had bought the land, and who had been residing there for the last fourteen or fifteen years. If the Minister for Works was satisfied that the way proposed was the only way in which the township could be reached, he had nothing to say against it, because it was, as he had said, a matter for the engineers to settle. He would like to ask the Minister for Works if the decision he came to last year was to be carried out strictly with regard to the only person who owned land through which the deviation would run? He saw that eight acres one rood twenty-one perches were to be resumed, and the hon. gentleman had stated that if any resumption of land was necessary from private persons it would have to be given by the persons through whose land the line would go. He thought that would scarcely be fair, and the Minister for Works would not be strictly just in insisting upon that being done in the present case, as the people up there had as good a right to receive compensation for resumption as people down here. He noticed that there had been nearly £200,000 paid for resumptions on the Southern and Western line. The Minister for Works had not alluded to the matter, and he thought it only fair that the person through whose land the deviation would run should be compensated for the eight acres which would be resumed. He knew the Premier had paid a good deal of attention to the matter of the deviation when he was at Hughenden, and had gone over the ground with Mr. Daniels, a very competent engineer, who showed that it could not well be carried into the town by any other route than by the loop-line shown on the plan.

Mr. NORTON said he thought the hon. member who had just sat down had raised a some-

what important question about taking the land from the person who owned the only private land on the route. He presumed the Minister for Works did not intend to deprive that person of his land without compensation, or he would have mentioned the fact to the Committee. If that person's land was improved in value by taking the line through it, the railway officers would no doubt consider that fact in awarding the compensation, and if the resumption of the land was of benefit to the public of Hughenden he was entitled to compensation. So far as the plans went, the engineers were the best judges in regard to them; and as to which was the best route to take, though it looked an ugly line on the map, the Minister for Works was perfectly justified and quite right in taking the line into the town. He knew there had been great complaints made about the line passing by the township. The people there were as much entitled to have the line taken close to the town as the people in other towns. Besides, if the line was taken according to the original plan, he was satisfied it would have occasioned endless petitions and applications for branch lines running into the town, or to have the route so changed as to bring it nearer to the town. The probability was that if it were not done the town itself would have been shifted out, and the people holding the most valuable property in the town at present would have had it very considerably depreciated. For his part he saw no objection to the line which had been proposed. He had no doubt the engineers were quite right in laying it down as they had done, because he presumed they had studied their own reputation in choosing the best route practicable.

The PREMIER said he had taken the opportunity when he was lately in Hughenden of going over the proposed deviation, and he was convinced it was the only way to get into Hughenden. It was very important to get into the town, because it was necessary that a railway station like that should be within reach of water for the engines, as well as that the town should be near the water. He was satisfied that it was a necessary thing, and that the proposed deviation was the only practicable way of doing it.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he could assure the hon. member for Port Curtis that he did not desire to deprive anyone of their land. It had appeared to him a ridiculous thing that, where a township which he believed contained about twenty people—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: About 200.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he did not think there were so many. It seemed ridiculous that they should have to take the railway through the township and resume the land which had just recently been bought from the Government. For a long time he stood out and threatened that if they did not give up the land he would not change the route; but at last he had to give way. However, all the land they would require to resume was about eight acres, which had been taken up as a selection under the Act of 1876, and, of course, it could be resumed at a very low price. No one was likely to make any great fortune out of the resumption of land.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN asked what greater length the deviation would add to the main line going westward?

The PREMIER: About a mile and three-quarters.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Minister for Works was somewhat mistaken in speaking of Hughenden as a town of twenty people.

The PREMIER: It has 400 or 500.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he should say it had. But it was near enough for the Minister for Works, considering the statements he usually made.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported the resolution to the House, and the resolution was adopted.

#### FASSIFERN BRANCH DEVIATION.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move—

That the Speaker do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions, namely:—

1. That the House approves of the plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed deviation of the Fassifern branch, between 3 miles 5 chains 43½ links and 3 miles 63 chains 63 links, in length 0 miles 62 chains 56½ links, as laid upon the table of the House on Tuesday, the 12th day of October instant.

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

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS, in moving—

1. That the House approves of the plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed deviation of the Fassifern branch, between 3 miles 5 chains 43½ links and 3 miles 63 chains 63 links, in length 0 miles 62 chains 56½ links, as laid upon the table of the House on Tuesday, the 12th day of October instant.

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

—said the deviation was urgently required. The gradient at that point was 1 in 30. A train with a fair load would have to put on a full head of steam to get up the gradient, and before they could get way off it would pass round a three-chain curve, so that it would be very dangerous indeed. The Government had therefore come to the conclusion to make a slight deviation, which would cost something about £2,000. There were about 7½ acres of land to resume. He thought any hon. member who had travelled on the line must have come to the conclusion that it should be altered. On every occasion when the train went round the curve the passengers were thrown from one side of the carriage to the other, and there was every possibility of the train leaving the rails. Under those circumstances the deviation had been proposed.

Mr. NORTON said he understood the hon. gentleman to say that the curve was a three-chain one. Was that so?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Mr. NORTON: And the gradient 1 in 30?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes.

Mr. NORTON said there was a spot a few miles out of Ipswich where there was a sharp curve and steep gradient; was that the place referred to?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said, yes; the spot referred to was called the Devil's Elbow, and was about three miles out of Ipswich. The curve was a very dangerous one, and the gradient being steep made it all the worse. Such a gradient on a straight line would be right enough, but taken with the curve it was most dangerous.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he was rather surprised to hear the Minister for Works say that the curve was a three-chain curve, because he was under the impression that there was no three-chain curve in the colony. On the Charters Towers line, going over the range, there was a  
1886—4 K

four-chain curve, but he thought the curve in question must be five chains. He knew that Mr. Stanley would not undertake five-chain curves, except on the Brisbane Valley line, and they had to be altered because they were found to be too sharp. A three-chain curve would be impracticable.

Mr. FOOTE said he did not know what the extent of the curve was, but he knew it was very short and was almost like an elbow when the line reached the end of Churchill. The work was a very necessary one, and it was a wonder that no accident had happened up to the present time. It was impossible to run anything like a load in greasy weather in consequence of the shortness of the curve and the steepness of the gradient.

Mr. NORTON asked whether the £2,000 covered the cost of the resumption of the land?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Of course not.

Mr. NORTON asked if the Minister had any idea of the value of the land required; or perhaps the hon. member for Bundamba would be able to tell them?

Mr. FOOTE said the land in the neighbourhood was not dear; in fact it was almost valueless.

Mr. NORTON: Until the Government want it.

Mr. FOOTE said the Government had power to resume it. They had a valuator, and those who did not accept the valuation usually got nothing.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed, the CHAIRMAN reported the resolution, and the resolution was adopted.

#### FORTITUDE VALLEY EXTENSION.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move—

That the Speaker do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions, namely:—

1. That the House approves of the plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed extension from the Brisbane terminal station through Fortitude Valley to Mayne, on the Sandgate Railway, commencing at 0 miles 17 chains 0 links and ending at 2 miles 34 chains 60 links, in length 2 miles 17 chains 60 links, as laid upon the table of the House on Tuesday, the 12th day of October instant.

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

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS, in moving—

1. That the House approves of the plan, section, and book of reference of the proposed extension from the Brisbane terminal station through Fortitude Valley to Mayne, on the Sandgate Railway, commencing at 0 miles 17 chains 0 links and ending at 2 miles 34 chains 60 links, in length 2 miles 17 chains 60 links, as laid upon the table of the House on Tuesday, the 12th day of October instant.

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

—said every hon. member must admit that it was very desirable that the passenger station should be built in the centre of the city. He did not think anyone would raise any objection to that. Looking at all large cities in the old country it would be seen that, at whatever cost, passenger traffic had always been taken into the centre of population and business. The present terminus at Brisbane was, for some reason or other—and he did not intend to blame the hon. member for

Townsville for it—left far from the centre of the town, and the longer it remained there the more costly would its removal become. That being so, the necessity arose of going straight ahead, and that meant the construction of the line right through Fortitude Valley, joining the Sandgate line at Mayne. Since the question was last before Parliament, the Government had decided to make a slight deviation from the plan as originally proposed. It was found that it would be utterly impossible to lower the gradient between Mayne and Bowen Park on account of the steep, rocky nature of the country, and Mayne had been finally fixed upon as the point of junction with the Sandgate line. There was not the slightest doubt that the work would have to be done sooner or later, and it was particularly desirable that it should be done now, seeing that they were about to connect, not only with the southern colonies, but with the main coast line going up towards Gympie, Bundaberg, and Gladstone. It was necessary that as straight a direction as possible should be taken. As he had said before, every hon. member must approve of carrying the passenger station into the centre of the city. If that was conceded, they must be prepared to proceed further in order to get out again. They had been backing and filling a good deal in their railway construction. Indeed, with regard to some of their stations, they had been going backside foremost, as witness the stations at Ipswich and Toowoomba. He wished hon. members distinctly to understand that the present Government was no respecter of persons. Their object was not to benefit specially the Fortitude Valley people or anybody else, but to benefit the entire community for all time to come. Their railways would not be for to-day or to-morrow, but for all time. They did not believe in putting down a railway to-day and pulling it up to-morrow, as had hitherto been the case. There was a place on the Western line called Mihi Creek where the line had to be taken up after having been laid down at a large cost to the country, and replaced by a straight line. The present Government were not going to be guilty of any such suicidal acts as that. They were determined to go straight, and as straight as possible without fear or favour.

Mr. BLACK : Very virtuous !

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the work now proposed was one of those which would have to be carried out some time or other, and every day it was left undone would add to its ultimate cost. When the present Government asked for a loan of £7,000,000 to carry out their railway policy, they decided that their lines should be permanent ones ; not put down to-day and pulled up to-morrow for the mere purpose of increasing the value of someone's private property. The present Government had set its face against all that sort of thing. The hon. member for Port Curtis laughed, and he was glad to see him enjoying himself, but there was nothing particular to laugh at in what he (Mr. Miles) was saying. However, returning to the question before the Committee, it was proposed to construct the line with very little interference with private property. A great portion of the work would be done by tunnelling, and by the direction it would take it would interfere very little with the crossing of streets ; and the rights of private property were interfered with to a very limited extent. Hon. members would observe that it was proposed to lay a branch from that line down the Bulimba road, though, of course, there was no provision made for that at present. It was marked in the plan just to show that the pro-

posed line was a proper route to take for reaching that particular point. According to the report, immediately beyond the city station the line would be conveyed by means of a tunnel 36½ chains in length under the following streets, namely :—Creek street, Wickham terrace, Wharf, Bowen, Raff, Boundary and Warren streets. The line would then run in open cutting across Gotha, Gipps, and Brunswick streets, all of which would be crossed over by the railway. Gipps street would require to be raised 6 feet, and Brunswick street 2½ feet, for that purpose. The railway station would be placed between Brunswick and Constance streets, where provision would be made for both passenger and goods traffic. There was no direction that the line would take which would interfere in the least with private property, and he was perfectly satisfied that if the passenger traffic was to be put upon a central site, that was the place it must come to. What was the result now ? A great many persons travelling by the Sandgate line left the train at Bowen Park. In fact, the whole of the people whose places of business were at the lower end of Queen street or Petrie's Bight left at that place. They could hardly be expected to go on to the Roma-street station, and then come back again. He thought, for that reason alone, it was necessary that the line should be extended through Fortitude Valley. More particularly when the North Coast line was completed, would it be absolutely necessary that that continuation should take place. The cost was put down at £174,000, and he was of opinion that it should be carried out, even if it cost £100,000 more, because it would be a line for all time to come.

Mr. NORTON said in looking over the plans he could not help feeling surprised that the hon. member should have brought them forward in their present form ; that was to say, after the decision given by the Committee last year he wondered the hon. gentleman did not submit something different. The only difference he saw between the plans now proposed and those which were proposed before was that the line kept a little more to the right, instead of going into Bowen Park, and destroying the National Association's grounds there. For his part he was of the same opinion he had been all along. He could not see what necessity there was for making two lines from here to Mayne, or to any other part of the North Coast line. It might be convenient for the people who used it to come into town a few minutes sooner, and be brought nearer to their business places than at present. But he could not see that for the sake of that slight convenience they were under an obligation to carry out that line. He did not object to the line going through Fortitude Valley at all ; he was rather in favour of it, and had always been. The object of carrying the line in that direction should be to carry it to deep water, to enable persons to send produce by the main line to Brisbane direct to the water side. That was a proposal that anybody could understand. The line should be extended to Fortitude Valley, so that the advantages of being connected with the main Southern and Western line would be conferred upon the people there to just the same extent as they were now conferred upon the people on the other side. He did not intend to say much upon the subject, because he believed it was the intention of an hon. gentleman on the other side of the Committee to make some proposals differing from those which had been already brought forward. He had heard that that was the case. It was only a rumour ; but he would like to hear what hon. members on the Government's own side had to say in connection with the matter before he spoke further on the subject.

The PREMIER said he would say a word or two in reference to the observations that fell from the hon. member. That hon. member said he had no objection to the railway towards Fortitude Valley. The proposed line was the only possible way to get to Fortitude Valley.

Mr. NORTON: No!

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman did not suggest another. They knew that lately there had been a suggestion made to take it to Petrie's Bight. Perhaps that was what the hon. member was thinking of. He was once very much taken with that line, and took a great deal of pains to investigate the subject. He was quite convinced it could be made at the time but was told by the engineers that it could not. He presumed that that was the only other possible line. They could not go along the water courses; they must go one side or the other. He was satisfied then that that line could not be made, and he was satisfied now that the one before them was the only one that could be. He would tell the Committee the processes his mind had gone through in coming to that conclusion. First of all he thought it was desirable to have a railway station at Petrie's Bight in communication with the wharves. But there were two objections. One was that the space was not large enough for a railway station; as the whole available level land was not long enough to hold an ordinary-sized train. That was one objection. The other was that it would be impossible to get there from the present railway station on account of the levels, and that would be apparent when he pointed out a few facts in respect to the extension now proposed. It was proposed that the station should be in Ann street. For some time he thought that Adelaide street would be the best place. Two years ago, when the plans were being prepared, he was at the Education Office very often, and could not see any reason why there should not be a railway station on the site of the Normal School. But on inquiry he found that—there was no possible mistake about it—if the station were put in Adelaide street, the level of the station would be above the first floor of the Normal School building, thirty feet above Adelaide street, and then the line would go from the station at the steepest incline possible with safety. They could not come into a terminal station on a steep incline.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: What was the gradient?

The PREMIER: About 1 in 100, which he thought was quite steep enough for safety. The present section showed 1 in 150, and they had no right to come into a terminal station at a steeper gradient. The terminal station would extend to Creek street, and its level would be thirty feet above the level of Adelaide street; and everyone knew that in the distance from there to Petrie's Bight they could not get down the thirty feet more, which was the difference of the levels. It was quite impossible. He had been very much surprised, because at first sight, when looking at the Roma street station, it seemed very much the same level as Queen street, but there was in fact thirty feet difference between the railway station and Adelaide street. They were therefore reduced to the proposed route or none. Of that he was quite satisfied. Another route suggested was to go from the present station through Wickham terrace into Victoria Park by means of a tunnel; but certainly it would not be worth while to save a quarter of a mile at the expense of a tunnel. The reason for making the proposed line was that it would pay. If it would not pay there was no justification for making it.

Mr. DONALDSON: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER said he believed it would pay, and for this reason: What paid best was suburban traffic. During the past few years, in Sydney, there were suburban trains every twenty minutes, and although rates were low they paid handsomely. The suburban traffic here was almost nothing to what it would be in consequence of the position of the railway station, which was too far away from the centre of the city. There never would be any suburban traffic until the line was brought into the centre of the city. If they were to have suburban traffic they must have a double line. The double line was now being laid from Ipswich to Brisbane. If the station were in the centre of the city, and they had a double line, he was quite satisfied that with the population along the line, which the railway would command, the traffic would be an extremely paying traffic. The line would also no doubt be a great advantage to Fortitude Valley. But that was only an incidental advantage. It would not be worth while to make a railway to Fortitude Valley merely to enable the people there to come into the city by train, but the Committee had to take into consideration the great number of people who came from Fortitude Valley and beyond, and who now stopped at Bowen Park. Actually it was more convenient to stop at a station two miles away than to come into town to the present station. In fact, the present position excluded suburban traffic. The line must come into the centre of the city in time, and no doubt the sooner they made it the cheaper they would get it. At the present time the line could be made more cheaply than at any future time, because the value of property would increase, and the more disturbance they made in private property the more costly it would be. The line passed under the most valuable private property by a tunnel, and in going into Fortitude Valley it was arranged not to disturb any streets. Those were reasons why the line ought to be made and ought to be made now. Of course £175,000 would not be sufficient to construct the whole of the line.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: How much will it cost?

The PREMIER said he had not a precise estimate at present.

Mr. NELSON: Half-a-million?

The PREMIER said it would not be that. It was quite evident that the amount voted would not finish the whole line; but the proposal was to define what they were going to do. The Committee was asked now to sanction the route, but the Government would not spend any more money than was voted. All they wanted at present was to go on with so much of the work as the money voted would cover. It was very desirable, before beginning the first section, to know what they were going to do when they got to the end of the section. They could not stop there, as it would only suit the Western traffic. When they came to work the trains on the Gympie line, which would be before long—probably as soon as that section was complete—it would be very inconvenient to have that traffic going out the same way as the Western traffic; the inconvenience of the central station would be intensified. He hoped that the line would meet with the general concurrence of hon. members, and that the Committee would reverse the decision given last session on imperfect knowledge and, to a great extent, under the influence of the late member for Fortitude Valley. He believed, on further consideration, that there was scarcely a difference of opinion amongst the inhabitants of the metropolis as to the route. The only difference was that some looked for the route of Petrie's Bight.

But that was a route that was not possible. If it were possible he himself would like it, for it had been a favourite scheme of his. But it was impossible, and it came to be this scheme or nothing. Every argument was in favour of the proposed route being adopted. As to the expenditure of money unauthorised, that was another matter altogether. The Government did not think themselves justified in spending money not appropriated.

Mr. NORTON said it was quite possible to take the line to deep water and not go by Petrie's Bight. What was the use of taking the line out of the present station without getting to deep water, or of having two lines? The hon. the Premier had spoken of passengers who got out at Bowen Park in coming from Sandgate. But did he mean to introduce the proposed line to compete with trams? Surely they did not intend to build it for that reason. He knew a gentleman who used to get out at Bowen Park simply because he wanted exercise, and preferred to walk in from there. That was a gentleman in the Lands Office. He was quite sure the saving in time in getting out at Bowen Park and coming by tram would be as nothing in coming in by the present route and going down town. He believed that if they were to join the two lines at all they ought to be joined at a considerable distance further down. His opinion was that if the line was to be extended at all it would have to be extended through the Valley to serve the large population there, and to get to deep water. He had not been referring to Petrie's Bight when he referred to deep water, but to a point very much lower down the river. Now, with regard to the opinion of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, who was now deceased—when the Valley line was brought before the Committee last session, he was quite sure that gentleman's opinions did influence members' votes, but it was not so much the opinions he held as the clear way he had expressed them, and the reasonable way he had represented them to the Committee. He believed that the substantial reasons that hon. member then gave for not carrying out the line on the proposed route were just as substantial now, and before he said any more on that point he should like to hear what the Minister for Works had to say on the matter. The extension of the railway into the city had been pleaded for by the people for years, and it would have to come sooner or later, the only question being as to the route it should take.

Mr. HAMILTON said he agreed with the hon. member that the reasons previously given for not carrying out the construction of the Valley railway along the proposed route were as good and substantial now as ever. The Government had gone through the form of promising the railway once or twice simply to delude the residents of the locality, because, if they chose to make it a party question, it would be carried. As it was, a supporter on the other side was going to propose an amendment to carry the line seventeen chains to Adelaide street, instead of two miles seventeen chains; and that amendment would be carried.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he was rather doubtful when he heard the speech of the Minister for Works whether the Government were really in earnest, but he had no doubt after hearing the Premier that they were not in earnest. That hon. gentleman said the line was to be a suburban line, and that it was to join the Sandgate line. There was certainly a steep grade between the Bowen Hills station and the Exhibition, but not one which it was impossible to overcome. As far as joining at Mayne, that was right, supposing that it was to join the Sandgate

line somewhere. But what was the use of making a suburban line to join the Sandgate line at all?

The PREMIER: It will bring the traffic from the Sandgate line to the city.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that if every individual living in Sandgate and along the line came in by the proposed line it would not pay. The hon. gentleman said he had not gone into a calculation of the cost, neither had he gone into a calculation as to the profits.

Mr. NORTON: Or the losses.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he must do both, because the cost must be deducted from the receipts before it was possible to arrive at the profits or the losses. The cost would be too great for the gain to be derived from the line. He would like to be able to vote for a line through the Valley which would be of advantage as a suburban line to the Valley, and also some distance further—that was, a line connecting the main line with deep water. He believed that such a line would ultimately pay as traffic increased, as a suburban line; but the proposed line, even if it got increased traffic, would take it from the Sandgate line. He hoped the Minister for Works would withdraw the motion and bring in a suburban line for the Valley, taking it to deep water where it would serve for shipping purposes at the same time. Such a motion would be passed unanimously; and the construction of such a line would not necessitate the adoption of the scheme the hon. gentleman said was impracticable, because deep water was to be found lower down, at Bulimba.

The PREMIER said that when he spoke previously he did not refer merely to passengers from Sandgate, but to passengers who would be carried by the suburban line. There were a great many suburbs between Brisbane and Sandgate, and they were rapidly extending; and very few of the people residing in those suburbs used the line. A great many of them said it was most inconvenient for them. He had never been to any place between Brisbane and Sandgate by train, and he did not think he ever would, as he could go more easily some other way.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is quicker to walk.

The PREMIER said he believed it was. The proposed line was necessary to give direct communication between the city and the North Coast Railway, and also between the city and deep water through the Valley. As to the cost, even if it cost £300,000 altogether, he believed it would yield a handsome return, and that there would be a profit after paying working expenses and interest. The hon. member did not seem to have much information as to the nature of suburban traffic. He thought the Sandgate line was never going to pay, but it had paid remarkably well. Suburban lines always paid well. Those round Melbourne paid well, and though the population of that city was much greater than that of Brisbane, their success was not owing to the fact of each line being used by the whole population. The line from Melbourne to Sandridge, for instance, was a suburban line accommodating the locality through which it passed, and affording facilities for shipping. And the line proposed to be taken through the Valley would be one of the same character.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that the Premier, in his argument in favour of the branch line which the Minister for Works had asked them to consent to that day, stated that the Sandgate line, which he (Mr. Macrossan) had prognosticated would not pay, had paid remarkably well under the circumstances. He must admit that it had paid very well indeed,

and he did not think it could have paid much better under any circumstances. If the hon. gentleman compared the takings on the Sandgate line with the takings on the branch between Brisbane and Oxley, he would find that the takings on the Sandgate line were larger than the takings on that line, which had been constructed for a very long time, and on which there was a very fair-sized town—Toowong. Now, the takings at the Toowong station for the last year, in round numbers, leaving out the odd pounds, shillings, and pence, were £1,600; while the takings at one station on the Sandgate line—certainly the best outside Sandgate—was £1,400. That was at the Albion. The Albion was a place that had sprung into existence since the Sandgate line was built; and Toowong had been twice as long in existence. The Sandgate line, he thought, had paid remarkably well—much better than the older branch; but when they came to compare the actual cost of the Sandgate line with the expected cost of the line they would see that it was the cost which very greatly prevented it from paying. Had that line been made at anything like a reasonable cost it would be paying probably 7 or 8 per cent. beyond the working expenses, whereas it did not pay more than 4 per cent. beyond the working expenses. The cost of the Sandgate line had been £10,000 per mile, and they certainly never expected it would cost more than £5,000 or £6,000 per mile, and the estimated cost was £4,000. Instead of it costing £5,000 or £6,000, it had cost £10,000 per mile. Now, when they compared the total cost of the Sandgate line—£114,000 in round numbers, at £10,000 a mile—with the amount which it was estimated the two miles of the extension under consideration was going to cost, they might see at once that those two miles of suburban line would—he would not say would never pay—but would not pay within the lifetime, he thought, of any member of the Committee. They were going to construct those two miles, not at a cost of £10,000 per mile, which the Sandgate line had cost, but at a cost of at least £150,000 per mile. There were only two miles to construct beyond the terminal station, and if they left the expense of the terminal station out he would be bound that the cost of construction with the cost of the resumption of the land would amount to £300,000. That would be £150,000 per mile for the two miles, and how could they expect it would pay with a passenger traffic alone? The only chance they had of making it pay was to bring it to deep water, when they would have a goods traffic as well as a passenger traffic. If they had a large goods traffic, such as they might expect to have with a branch connecting the whole of the Southern and Western, the North Coast system, and the Southern Border system with deep water, they might expect some returns for it. With the proposal of the Government he could not see what returns they could expect beyond the returns they already had from the Sandgate line. If they looked at the plans as laid on the table of the House, with the exception of the station which was going to be made in the Valley, near Brunswick street, there was no other station from which there could be any remuneration, and if that station brought in any remuneration whatever it would be taken from the other line. They were asked to make a branch line to compete with a line they already had, and to make it at a cost per mile beyond the whole cost of the Sandgate line; and yet the hon. gentleman thought it would pay. His faith must be very great indeed; it must be sufficient to move mountains; but he did not think the hon. gentleman could make any member of the Committee believe it.

Mr. McMASTER said that in the earlier part of the evening he was glad to hear the hon. member for Townsville admit that it was desirable that some measure of justice should be given to Fortitude Valley, and that he would be willing to support some measure of justice of that kind. He was pleased to hear that, as he believed the hon. member was in earnest about it if the line was taken by what he thought the proper route. It was most unfortunate for the Valley that the line had been called the "Valley line" at all. He understood that the line, so far as it was asked to be constructed now, was part of the main trunk line, connecting the Southern and Western line and the North Coast line. He thought the Government brought that line in amongst other railways when they came into office, believing that it was desirable to extend the line from the present station at North Brisbane into the centre of the city. If it was desirable to do that—and he held it was—then, as a matter of economy, notwithstanding the amount the hon. member for Townsville said those two miles would cost—as a matter of economy it would have to go on. The leader of the Opposition smiled at that, but he said that the cost of backing out and shunting towards Milton to get on to the Northern line would run away with a good deal of the money in ten years. He took it that that line was to connect the two trunk lines. He would remind hon. members on the other side that the Government had shown on the plan that it was desirable some day—as soon as the House considered it desirable to do so—to connect that line with the branch line to deep water; and he thought the time was not far distant when it would be necessary to connect their main trunk lines with deep water, and to push on with the extension of the line to deep water at once. He believed before the Gympie line was completed, and before the line under discussion was completed—before it went through Fortitude Valley—there would be sufficient trade to justify the Government in considering whether it would not be desirable to run a branch line to the deep-water reach of the river. The Government had at all events admitted on the plan that they believed it would be necessary to do it, and he considered that the time was not far distant when the necessity would arise. But if the trade was not there to necessitate a branch line being at once taken to deep water, was that any reason why the main line should not be taken there and connected with the Northern line? He questioned if the proposed line was going to do the people of Fortitude Valley so much good as hon. members thought. It was going to do them good in this respect—that it would bring them within easy communication with the North, South, and West lines; and he considered the position chosen for the station was as central, and as easily accessible a position, as any they could find in Fortitude Valley. It had been stated earlier in the evening that the line should go by Petrie's Bight, and thence on to Bulimba and deep water. He hoped to live to see the day when the line would go down the bank of the river towards the Hamilton. He believed it would be wanted some day, but it was not required yet. The Chief Secretary had shown that it was impossible to construct the line to Petrie's Bight, and get an outlet to the main stations already in existence. There was no part of Fortitude Valley through which the railway could be taken so as to injure less property than that proposed in the plans. He knew every street and locality in the Valley, and he knew that was the case. The proposed station in Brunswick street was accessible from New Farm by the tram, which would come within less than 100 yards of it; it was accessible

from the other side by tram and omnibus; it was accessible from what was known as Kingsholme or Teneriffe by omnibuses coming down James street; so that from any portion of the eastern part of the Valley district the station could be reached for 3d. It was not so with the present station; it was cheaper at present to go to Sandgate and back by hired trap than by railway, taking into account the expense of going to the railway and back, and the railway charges. The proposed station was more central and more easy to come at than any other place proposed in the Valley. The people in the Valley were perfectly satisfied to accept the line which the Government had thought most suitable. None of them had asked for any particular route, with the exception of some persons who had land for sale, and wanted the line to go through their property, so that they might dispose of it at a high figure. Those persons wanted to take the railway through Petrie's Bight, and through a tunnel that would not come out in Fortitude Valley till it was beyond where the people were living. It was to come out in Jane street, which was beyond the Valley altogether. Who was going to walk down from Bowen terrace or from Brunswick street to Jane street, to go into town by candle-light? There would be a tunnel all the way, except for a small portion of Petrie's Bight. The tunnel at present proposed was only a short one, and came out exactly in the centre of population. He was quite certain that if that railway was not carried now—he hoped it would be—it would be carried some day. Whether the present Government carried it or not, some Government would carry it. He might say that he thought the present plan a great improvement on the plan shown last year; it avoided the park and took a better route, to his mind. The line was a necessity if the railway was to be worked properly. As the Minister for Works had put it, almost every station in the southern portion of the colony had been left outside the city. In Warwick you had to travel half-a-mile from the railway station to the city; at Toowoomba you were kept shunting backwards and forwards; at Ipswich the Government had had to remove the station so as to make a straight line; and Brisbane was no exception—as the station was left outside the city. It was necessary that the station should be brought into the centre of the city; he did not object to that, but he objected to its being brought in and left there, and the Valley left out in the cold. He thought the plan ought to commend itself to any person who was anxious to see the two railways constructed. He hoped some day to see ships lying on the reach lower down the river, so that goods for Gympie, or the other townships that might spring up between here and there, could be taken from the ship's side and sent up, without the necessity of their being brought round Victoria Park into the town and then taken back, making a double journey which was charged at per mile. He hoped the train would be able to go into Bulimba, if that was where the branch would be, and thus the goods could be taken straight on to the Gympie line. He thought that would commend itself to every hon. member of the Committee.

Mr. KELLETT said he thought one of the principal objections to the line which was proposed was that the money voted by the House was not sufficient for making the line. The amount voted was £175,000, and the Chief Secretary, to whom they might give credit for having found out something like the probable cost, estimated it at £300,000; but he was afraid that would fall short of the amount. He thought that if they decided to extend the line in a certain direction it would be advisable to propose to extend it only so far as their money would

make it. Anyone looking at the map on the table would see that those lines to the Valley ran parallel; he did not think it was a mile from one to the other. All the arguments they had heard treated the line as a passenger line.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No!

Mr. KELLETT said he had not heard of anything else, and so far as he could see there would be nothing but passenger traffic; but he was afraid that a great number of the passengers who would travel by the proposed line would be those who might have travelled by the other. He always considered, at the time the Sandgate line was being built, that of the three surveys they took the worst; and he thought that a good many people who were not so strongly of his opinion then had come round to it now. It was taken through Victoria Park, where there was no settlement, and so far as he could understand, it was taken that way to prove the words made use of by the Ministers of the day, that a Sandgate railway would not pay. But in spite of its being taken to an outside place, suburban buildings had grown up to such an extent that he believed it was now about as profitable a line as any in the whole railway system. If they were to put another railway beside that, the Government should be in a position to propound their scheme. They knew how other deviations had been made. A railway through Ipswich, many years ago, was taken by a very circuitous route. He believed at that time railways were made chiefly for the compensation granted to certain persons. Then it was found that certain persons wanted compensation in another direction, so that railway was pulled up and taken by another route. Though there was a good deal of money expended over that, he believed the line was finally put in its proper place. If the Government in this case were dissatisfied with the present line, and proposed to pull it up and make a direct line, there might be something in it, and perhaps they would be justified in spending the money it was likely to cost. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley mentioned the idea of a branch to the Bulimba reach. Of course, he (Mr. Kellett) was satisfied it was only a question of time when there must be a railway to the Bulimba reach, because it was a grand shipping place; but he was sure the hon. member would be more likely to see a branch constructed from Bowen Hills, or thereabouts, to Bulimba than if the present scheme were carried out. There was not enough money to complete the scheme, and the consequence would be that the line would stop when it reached the proposed junction at Mayne. It had been acknowledged for some time that it was advisable that the present terminus should be extended to the centre of the town, and as the first section of the proposed line would be to the proposed new central station, he thought it well that it should stop there, and it could be found out afterwards whether it was advisable to go any further. The Premier had mentioned that for many years it had been a hobby of his that the main line should be carried to the river at Petrie's Bight, but upon inquiry he found that that could not be. Well, he (Mr. Kellett) understood that to the effect that there would have to be a gradient of 1 in 60, and he did not think there would be any difficulty in making a short line with such a gradient.

The PREMIER: It is steeper than that.

Mr. KELLETT said that was a matter of opinion. He had made inquiries and thought he was not far wrong. Though he believed Bulimba would be a great shipping centre in the future, he went so far as to say that, even at the cost of a little more money, the railway should first be constructed to the wharves at Petrie's Bight. Large



businesses had been established in the town, and wharves built on both sides of the river, and he thought it would be a great injustice to the citizens of Brisbane, to the commercial men of Brisbane, to those who had established large businesses, even if the Valley route were ever so much easier and less expensive, to run quite past them, leaving their wharves alone, and attempt to establish a new wharfage system at Bulimba. He might say that he happened to have a big interest just along the Bulimba reach, but he had none at all in the city, and it would be greatly to his advantage if a line of railway were to run to Bulimba; but he said it would be unjust, after the hundreds of thousands of pounds that had been spent in wharfage in the centre of the city, to run right past it and ignore entirely those who had built up the commercial interests of the metropolis. That should be taken into consideration, and they should be very careful and find out whether they could not get to the river in some way or other before they gave countenance to the proposed scheme. When the transcontinental railway was proposed one of the arguments brought against it was that they had initiated a system of railways running from the several coast towns, and going westward to the centre of the colony; and that it would be a great injustice to the different towns and centres of population to take a railway at the back of them and run it out to the Gulf of Carpentaria. That was one of the strongest arguments used against the transcontinental railway route, and the same argument held good in the present case—that it would do wrong to the commercial population of the city of Brisbane, centred round about the wharves, to take a railway past the river out to some further place and establish in the distance a new centre. That proposal would be right enough when the city grew larger. He admitted that Fortitude Valley was a large, important, and rising place, but at the same time if the railway was carried through it, and if it was extended within twelve months to Bulimba, it would be many years before the wharves which would be constructed would be utilised. The merchants and tradespeople were established in the city, and he must remind hon. members that the new wharves and new interests of Bulimba must be established by new people, and that must necessarily take a long time. For the benefit of the people of Brisbane, and for the benefit of the people of Fortitude Valley, he proposed to move an amendment. He said, for the benefit of the people of the Valley, because to the central station in Brisbane from the centre of the Valley would be a shorter distance than from Queen street to Roma street. The Valley people would be in a better position with the central station right in the town than the people of Queen street now were, so that he thought the Valley people would derive just as much benefit as the people of any other district round Brisbane. He was sorry to have to differ from the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, but he was, he believed, speaking in the interests of the Valley people. Half-a-loaf was better than no bread, and he thought, therefore, the senior member for Fortitude Valley ought to be very glad to see an amendment moved which had some chance of being carried, because of this he was convinced: that the motion, as it stood, would not be carried. He had, therefore, much pleasure in moving the omission of all the words in the first paragraph after the word "station," on the 2d line, with a view of inserting the words "to the central station, Creek street."

The PREMIER said he was sure the merchants and wharf-owners of Brisbane would be very much obliged to the hon. member for Stanley for the interest he took in their welfare,

but he (the Premier) was one of the members for North Brisbane, and he had never heard that they felt any alarm about the proposed extension of the railway through Fortitude Valley for the benefit of the general public. He did not think their interests would suffer, and if they did that was not a sufficient reason for not making a line which would be beneficial to the entire community. It had been said that the line was only advocated as a line for passengers. He advocated the line as a line that would pay. It would not only pay immediately in consequence of the enormous increase of suburban traffic, but it would pay because it would give means of access to deep water. There was no other route that could be constructed which would pay. But the fact that it was a line for the metropolis was a very good reason why some hon. members should vote against it. He did not use the argument, as some did, that the expenditure of money should be made in proportion to population. If he did it would be easy to adduce overwhelming reasons why that line should be made. He wished the line to be considered on its merits, and on nothing else, and he was sorry to see indications that it was not going to be considered on its merits. To bring the line into the centre of the city and leave it there would be a great convenience to people coming in by train from the West; but it would be no convenience whatever to people coming in from the North or the East. It was said the proposed line would compete with the existing line as far as Mayne. Of course it would; but that line was in the wrong place. If that line had been in the right place it would not have been necessary to propose the one now before the Committee. It was the competition of a line running through Victoria Park with a line running through the most thickly populated part of the city. It was not perhaps of much use talking very much more about it. Hon. members were tolerably familiar with the locality, and they knew that it was intended to go on with the Northern Coast line, which he believed would be one of the best paying lines in the colony when it was finished. If the line was taken to Adelaide street, it must most certainly be carried further. The entire line as proposed could not be made at once, because the money it would cost had not been voted, and the Government would not spend money on that or any other line without the sanction of Parliament. Should they affirm that that was the proper route, that was the question? They had just as much information to go upon now as they would ever have, and for his own part he should be much disappointed if the Committee did not affirm that that was the proper route to take, instead of insisting that the line should run into a *cul-de-sac* in the centre of the city.

Mr. NORTON said it appeared to him, notwithstanding the remark of the Premier to the contrary, that the question was really being decided on its merits. As the motion was being opposed by the hon. gentleman's own followers, there was no reason to suppose that they were animated by improper motives. The opposition to the line now, as on the former occasion, was raised solely because the Committee disapproved of it. For his own part he should refuse to regard the railway policy of the colony as in any way a party question; the subject was one of too vast importance to be treated from a party point of view. At the same time, if a majority of the Committee, consisting of members on both sides, voted entirely in accordance with their own opinions on the question, he failed to see how the charge could be brought against them that they were not voting for the line on its merits. He at any rate believed they were, both from what he had seen in the Committee and heard



outside. The amendment of the hon. member for Stanley seemed to him to be a reasonable one to be made, and if it was accepted it would make no difference as to the route the line would ultimately take. The next Parliament would surely be in a better position than they were to decide which way the line ought to go, and their hands would not be bound by any action—which might turn out to be injudicious action—of the present Parliament. He was glad the amendment had been moved, and he intended to vote for it; and he supposed other hon. members would have the same freedom to follow their own judgment upon it as he claimed for himself.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said a great many remarks had been made as to the inconvenient site of the existing railway terminus. In his opinion it was in a very convenient position. It was not three-quarters of a mile from the post-office, nor half-a-mile from the town hall. He had never seen a central station in the middle of a city in any part of the world, and he had travelled about a good deal in his time. The terminus was in a very fair situation, both for North Brisbane, South Brisbane, and Fortitude Valley. The Chief Secretary said that although he was a representative of North Brisbane, his constituents had not found fault with the proposed railway through Fortitude Valley. He (Mr. Lumley Hill) was one of the hon. gentleman's constituents, and he held that the members for both North Brisbane and South Brisbane would be neglecting their duties towards their constituents if they allowed the trade of the place to be attempted to be filched away in that manner. It was not as if wharfage accommodation at North and South Brisbane was insufficient for the trade of the port. There was enough wharfage accommodation for years to come; and he trusted that the Chairman, as the representative of his interests in South Brisbane, would recognise the force of his argument. He was interested personally in the welfare and prosperity of the whole of the metropolis, and he could see plainly the good which the expenditure of so large an amount of money would do. The Chief Secretary had estimated the total cost of the proposed line at £300,000. He had heard it estimated by good authorities at £500,000. Split the difference, and say they were going to spend £400,000 on a line to compete with the tram-line and the existing railway line. It must compete with one or the other, and he could not see why this other line should be laid down at a cost to the whole community of £400,000. What, on the face of the earth, was the good of it to anybody except the people in the immediate vicinity? It would be precious little use to them, as everybody could not have a railway to his back door. What did it matter where a man's goods came in, unless they took the line right down to the wharves, whether he carted them one mile or half-a-mile? The railway station was in a very good place where it was, and he should be well content to see it remain there. Certainly the amendment of the hon. member for Stanley was very much better than the proposal of the Government, because he did not believe it would cost such a very extreme sum of money, and it would be nearer the heart of the city. For his own part he would endeavour to point out to the representatives of the metropolis that that £400,000 would construct 100 miles of railway in the interior—anywhere—not only in the West, but in the Logan, or Laidley Creek, or anywhere else. The Government might run it up any gully they liked, he did not care where; but they would find that the additional trade it would bring in would be of far greater value to the citizens of this fair city, in whose interests he spoke, than running a line between the existing tram-line and the existing

railway line, and which would not do, so far as he could see, any particle of good to the community beyond those people whose doors it ran past, or whose land was resumed. He would rather take one-fourth of the amount—£100,000—and throw it away in the Valley at once to save the other £300,000—give it to the people to stop their mouths. It was a political railway, and was brought up upon every occasion. Every representative, at every election which took place in the Valley, had to go in bald-headed for the Valley railway, and the Government of the day had to say that they would back him up in doing it. He did not care what Government it was—the present one, or one from the other side. They all said, "We will give you your railway, or at least do the best we can." He hoped that such a political job would never go through the Committee. Let the Valley people wait until the present wharves were crowded out in Brisbane, and then they might hope to get their railway.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. gentleman had just made one of the most extraordinary speeches he had ever listened to. But he rose to refer to the speech made by the hon. member for Stanley, Mr. Kellett, who maintained that it was unfair to carry the line through the Valley and down to the Bulimba Reach, because they would be taking away the trade from the wharves at Petrie's Bight. The hon. gentleman could not have known what he was talking about when he moved his amendment, because it was utterly impossible to get down from the station which was now proposed as a passenger station at the fire brigade station. If any hon. gentleman would go and stand up there, he would see that it would be impossible to go down to Petrie's Bight on an ordinary gradient.

Mr. STEVENSON: He is not asking you to take it there.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: That is not the amendment.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said if the amendment of the hon. member for Stanley were carried they would be pursuing the same course they had hitherto pursued, and when the train came into the central station it would have to back out again, and go away round by Bowen Park. It was exactly the same principle that had been acted upon throughout simply from interested motives, and for the purpose of benefiting some particular people. The plan proposed by the Government was a direct line, and they hoped to have trains running from the southern colonies direct to Brisbane, and from Brisbane up along the North Coast line. He hoped the hon. member would take a common-sense view of the matter. What was all the outcry about a few hundred thousand pounds? They had got a big country, and a country of which they could not exhaust the resources, and yet some hon. members cried out about a few hundred thousand pounds being spent upon their main line. Nobody but a lunatic would do such a thing. He maintained that the line proposed by the Government was a proper one, and one that ought to be carried, and if it was not carried out now it would be before very long. There was no better line possible for getting to deep water in the Bulimba reach than the one proposed. He wished hon. members would get rid of those pettifogging arrangements, and go in for a little common sense, and carry the line out in the direction proposed by the Government, which would not only benefit the metropolis, but would benefit the colony as a whole. He asked hon. members to look at the folly of carrying a railway into the centre of the city, that they could not connect with the Northern line without having to back out and

go round Bowen Park. He was sure that any-one travelling in the colony could not fail to see the blunder that had been made, particularly with regard to the Southern and Western line. He was, however, convinced that there had not been the same jobbery in the North; but lines in the South had been built in the interest of private individuals, and not in the interest of the country.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: And now you are going to build another?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he wondered what hon. members were laughing at. He could see his way very clearly as to which direction the line should take. In the interests of the country he hoped that the Government would be able to carry out the line as proposed by them. Why should hon. members hesitate in voting the money? The thing was clearly put before them, and he trusted the Committee would not stultify itself by voting for the amendment of the hon. member for Stanley.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said he thought he ought to say half-a-dozen words upon the question. He hoped the Committee would vote straight against the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Stanley. He thought they ought to do so, and he trusted that the proposal of the Government would commend itself to the common sense of the whole community. There could be no two opinions about it that they had a reasonable proposal, and one that ought to be supported. He was surprised to hear from his side of the Committee an amendment, which practically upset the whole scheme. Before he went any further he must protest against this being called a Valley railway. That was a very unfair use to make of the Valley. If any hon. member would look at the map and plans, and measure the proposed extension, he would find that only one-fifth of the line passed through the Valley—the other four-fifths of it belonged to other electorates. He hoped the Committee would vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Stanley. Supporters of the Government were bound to support it on the ground suggested by the Minister for Works. In 1884 they voted for certain loan proposals. One of them was for an extension of the railway to the city and to Fortitude Valley, and £175,000 was voted for that purpose, and now they were asked by the amendment to vote against that. They were simply to vote for bringing the line into the city of Brisbane, and thereby to stultify themselves, as the Minister for Works put it, and put it correctly, by wiping out or trying to squelch the former vote. He therefore counted on the whole of the votes of the Government party on his side of the Committee in support of the proposals of the Government. He did not see how any member on that side of the Committee could vote in any other way without stultifying himself. He looked to the other side of the Committee to vote for the proposal, and when he looked upon those hon. members, and gauged their intelligence and general gentlemanliness, he could not see how they could vote against it. And for this reason, that they had now a fine opportunity offered them for making an atonement for an evil committed not long ago. It was generally admitted that the Sandgate Railway had not been taken in a proper direction. He could speak coolly on that matter, for he was not in the colony at that time. He could look at it without any prejudice, and he felt, as thousands of others felt, that that line was constructed in the wrong place, and that an injustice was done to Fortitude Valley and certain parts of Enoggera. Hon. members opposite who were chiefly responsible for that had an opportunity of making

an atonement for the wrong then committed. He hoped they would take advantage of it—it was a rare chance for them—and vote for the Government proposal, and rectify the injustice to which some of them were parties when the Sandgate Railway was constructed. Looking at it in that light, they were safe and sure of arriving at a good majority in favour of the Government proposal. The Government supporters could not vote against it, justly and honourably; and the members on the other side had an opportunity of doing good to themselves, and a far greater good to the city of Brisbane and Fortitude Valley. It had been asserted again and again, and it could not be too often reasserted, that this was a thing that must be done. They could not get away from it. That connection must be made some day or other, and when would they have a finer opportunity? As to the resumption of land required, they would get it now at a far better rate than in five years' time. They were in a far better position for carrying on the work as now supported by the Government—to carry it on a certain way for £175,000. He had no idea that it would be finished for that sum; but suppose it needed another £125,000, that was a mere trifle. The hon. member for Cook had given a capital reason why he should vote against the scheme, but he would like to ask that hon. gentleman and the hon. member for Stanley whether they had a ghost of an idea of confining the trade of Brisbane to the present wharves of North and South Brisbane? Was that Bulimba reach to lie for ever unused?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: There is plenty of time to go there.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS: Ought they not to aim at that—so grand a spot for wharves—now, before the country got more fully settled? They could do it now more cheaply. Let them learn wisdom from the mistakes made in the southern colonies—in Sydney and Melbourne—and avoid them. Let them lay out their plans on a grand national basis!

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Hear, hear!

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said he did not want hon. members to look upon Fortitude Valley alone. Perhaps it did affect them in the Valley to a considerable extent; but he wanted them to look at the proposed scheme as a grand necessary connecting link between the Southern and Western Railways and the Northern system of railways. It must come. No opposition to the proposal could stop that, and hon. members would show wisdom, and ability to comprehend something national, great and grand, by voting against the amendment of the hon. member for Stanley, and in favour of the Government proposal. He did not know that he need say more on the matter. Reference had been made to the previous vote on the question. He was not in the House then, but he had read the debate, and he thought—he might be wrong—but his idea was that that matter had not been settled on its merits, but simply because the then representatives of Fortitude Valley were divided—not of one mind. The Committee took advantage of that fact. They said "We are willing: we think it right that this Valley railway should be built, but the representatives do not seem to be of the same mind; they are divided as to where it should go: therefore we won't let them have it at all." That was his notion. It was not so now. The representatives of Fortitude Valley were of one mind on that question. They moved together there unmistakably, and hon. members would show they had some real good sound common sense by voting with the Government on the matter.

Mr. STEVENSON said he had no objection to vote for the Valley railway if he had heard any good reasons for doing so. He had waited patiently; he had heard two Ministers and the two members for Fortitude Valley speak, but he had not yet heard one reason why they should construct the proposed railway. They were asked to take a leap in the dark. The Premier told them it would pay, but when he was asked what it would cost he had no more idea than the "man in the moon." He first told them £175,000, and the next time he spoke he told them he did not think it would cost £300,000. How did he know? He (Mr. Stevenson) did not believe the Ministers were serious, or that they cared a single farthing if the railway was chucked out. If they had been serious they would have had the whole of the figures before the Committee. He did not see how the Government could ask the Committee to pass the resolution that night without having some facts before them. The members for Fortitude Valley were in the same position. They had not given the Committee any figures at all. They said it would be a better route to bring traffic and that it would pay, but they had no more idea what the land would cost than the "man in the moon." The member for Cook gave a very good reason why the railway should not be constructed at the present time. He thought with him that the present terminus was in a very good position—as good as in any of the cities of the colonies. For instance, let them take Sydney. The railway station there was two miles out of town. Did the Premier wish to do away with private enterprise in Brisbane? Did he wish to increase the number of the unemployed by doing away with omnibus and cab drivers and all sorts of things? The proposition of the Government was simply absurd. When once they had got the railway station in such a position as it was in this city, they ought to be satisfied. It did not matter whether they had to drive a quarter or half a mile from the station to get to their homes. He thought no sufficient reason had been given why the resolutions should be passed by the Committee. Reference had been made to the stand taken on that matter by the late member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Beattie, whom he regretted was now gone, who was a very good member of that committee, and who had laid that question before the committee more clearly than any hon. member who had spoken that evening. That hon. member influenced the committee when a similar proposal was before them on a previous occasion to such an extent that the railway was thrown out. And he (Mr. Stevenson) thought they had very good reasons for throwing out the proposal again that evening. He could not understand the argument of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley against carrying out the railway by Petrie's Bight. He (Mr. Stevenson) thought the cheapest way to construct the line was by tunnelling and having a station underground. People could get up from an underground station in the same way as they could get up any other stairs. An underground railway would be far cheaper and of far more good to the city of Brisbane than the line now proposed by the Government. Before passing the resolution under discussion hon. members ought to have better reasons given them than had yet been offered; they should have a better reason than that given by the Premier—that because the Committee had voted £175,000 to take a railway somewhere they must take it somewhere. They should know what it would cost and whether it was likely to pay interest; all that information should be furnished to the Committee before the resolutions were passed.

Mr. McMASTER said the hon. member who had just sat down told them that they ought to show what would be the expense of the line, and put the figures before the Committee. He (Mr. McMASTER) did not think it was the duty of the members for Fortitude Valley to find out those figures. That was the duty of the Government, and no doubt they had gone into the matter fully. The hon. member for Normanby had also stated that to take the railway through Petrie's Bight, and thence through the Valley, would be more beneficial to the people of Fortitude Valley and citizens than the route proposed by the Government. Surely the hon. member must think that the members on his own side as well as those on the Government side of the Committee were very ignorant of the locality and of the expense of making a railway there if he expected them to accept that statement. It would cost three times the amount to construct the line through Petrie's Bight to Bulimba than it would by the route proposed by the Government. That was apparent to anyone of common sense. It did not require the intelligence of an engineer to see that, or the intelligence of the hon. member for Normanby. Such a line would be a continuous tunnel from beginning to end.

Mr. STEVENSON: The very thing that is wanted; that will save the resumption of land.

Mr. McMASTER said it was not the very thing that was wanted. He could not understand the arguments used by hon. members on the opposite side, by the hon. member who proposed the amendment, and the hon. member for Cook. The argument on a former occasion in effect amounted to this: "We will not support this railway because it does not go to deep water." What did they find now? Why, hon. members said, "We will not allow you to take this railway in the direction indicated, because it is proposed to take it to deep water some day." They did that because they had property in the centre of the city; they made no secret of that. The hon. member for Cook told them that he had a large property in Brisbane, and he did not want the trade taken away from North Brisbane or South Brisbane to Bulimba. Neither did the members for Fortitude Valley. They did not desire to take one single pennyworth of the trade away from the wharves in the city proper, or from the south side until it was required. They simply said that the proposal of the Government, in the meantime, was a continuation of the main trunk line, and they had wisely shown a branch line from that to deep water, which branch line would be constructed when the trade justified it. The Government did not want to injure either North Brisbane or South Brisbane. Neither did he nor his colleagues. Therefore he considered they had the best of the argument. Members on the other side had admitted that a railway would be a necessity some day, and he believed if the Opposition was to come into power to-morrow—which he hoped they would not, nor for many years yet—and the hon. member for Townsville was to be in the Works Department, that would be one of the first works he would carry out. He believed the hon. gentleman now saw the mistake that was made in taking the railway down through Victoria Park to Sandgate, when it should have gone through Fortitude Valley. As he had said before, the Government were first blamed for not taking the railway to deep water, and now they were blamed for taking it where it would be accessible from deep water. The hon. member for Stanley said it would be to the interest of the people of Fortitude Valley to accept his amendment. He thanked the hon. member, and would point out

that it would be to his interests to adopt the proposal of the Government and bring the station to the Normal School, because it would bring the line, perhaps not to the hon. member's back door, but, at any rate, to his front door. He (Mr. McMaster) thought Fortitude Valley had a right to be put in communication with the main trunk line as much as the people of the city, and he said now, in answer to the hon. member for Cook, that the present terminus of the railway was not in the proper place. It was like the handle of a jug—it was on one side of the city; it was away from the wharves, away from the centre of population, and away from the centre of business places. He maintained that it was a necessity that the railway should come into the centre of the city, and the longer they left it where it was the more it would cost to construct the line. It had been said, "What about the terminus in Sydney?" Well, he would remind hon. members that the Government of New South Wales were asking authority for the Legislature of that colony to take the line round to Circular Quay at a cost of five times what the work might have been done for a few years ago. That was what was proposed to be done in Sydney, and they would have to do a similar thing yet in Brisbane. He believed the day was not far distant when the wharves, not only in North Brisbane and South Brisbane, but also at Bulimba, would be fully occupied. He was not jealous of South Brisbane; he never had been. He assisted to build some of the finest wharves there that were to be found in the colonies. He believed that there was not anything in the colonies, either in Sydney or Melbourne, equal to the municipal wharves that had been constructed in South Brisbane, and he was only sorry that there was not more trade in that reach of the river, so that those wharves could be fully and regularly occupied. He believed the day was coming, and was not far distant, when not only would that wharf be required, but when they would be unable to accommodate all the traffic even with wharves all along that reach. The amendment was very good so far as it went, but he took it that the Government were in duty bound to stand by their own policy. It was not the Valley people who had asked for the proposed line. The Government brought it forward, and the people of the Valley were satisfied with it. The Government saw the necessity for carrying on the trunk line so as to connect the two branch lines in order to save shunting and backing. Those hon. members who knew so much about the cost must have gone into figures, and must have got behind the scenes. There had been various haphazard statements to the effect that the line would cost £200,000, or £250,000, or even £300,000. Admitting that it would cost £300,000, it would not be the first railway that had cost £300,000. They had been told that the money could be better spent on lines out west. He did not object to lines in the West or in the North. Wherever there was good country make a railway; wherever there was sufficient population make a railway. The mistake in making the Sandgate line through the Victoria Park was that it was made where there was no population. He was not going to argue that the proposed line was going to be useful only for passenger traffic; it would also carry a large quantity of goods. He had no doubt that the line ought to be made as proposed by the Government, but he was prepared to meet the views of those who supported the amendment to a certain extent. Let it be decided that the whole line was to be constructed, and let tenders be called for the construction of the line in two or three sections, the first section being the part between the present railway station and the Normal School.

Mr. KELLETT said it was a sure proof of a poor argument when a man imputed interested motives to another, and that was the only thing he could see in the speech just made. So far from being interested in the line proposed in the amendment, he happened to have a short lease not far from the place where the station would be, so that it was of no interest to him whether the line was taken there or not. He had a large interest, however, as the hon. member knew, in a property where the line proposed by the Government would go; so that when the hon. member made his statement he knew the contrary to be the fact.

Mr. ADAMS said he must congratulate the Valley people on returning the present members, and he thought that those who threw out the motion last year were to be congratulated also. It was just like the man who hung a bag of oats before his horse so that he would follow it. He thought the bait was hung before the electors of Fortitude Valley for the purpose of enabling the Government to carry on their cause, and it would be unwise to take away the bait now, because when they went back to the electors next time there would be no bag of oats to shake before those electors. If the Committee did not take away the bait those hon. members would be able to say again that they would advocate the Valley railway. They heard a great deal about the unemployed; and he should like to know what the Valley railway would do for the unemployed. The line was about two and a-half miles long, and would cost about £175,000, according to some, and according to others, £500,000. A gentleman writing in the Government organ of Monday last under the *nom de plume* of "Economy" said it would cost one-twentieth of the £10,000,000 loan to construct the railway. If the Government supporters were so terribly interested in the welfare of the colony, and wished to give employment to the people walking about seeking work, why did they not vote money for railways in districts where people could settle on the land—people who would soon be able to employ labour in working that land? He thought it was madness to spend £150,000 per mile for constructing a railway in a place where the people could travel by tramcars or omnibuses anywhere within 500 yards of the railway. Every individual settled on the land meant an increase to the revenue of the colony, and it would be far wiser to carry out the railways into the interior than to squander the money in the metropolis. If they totted up the amount spent in the metropolis they would find that it amounted to one-quarter of the revenue of the colony, and the consequence was that people had been relying so much upon borrowed money and Government pay within a radius of 100 or 150 miles of Brisbane that they did not think it their duty to follow the example of the pioneers, and subdue the forest and bring it under cultivation. Therefore, he hoped, notwithstanding all that had fallen from hon. members on the other side—that the Committee would not squander the money, but allow the members for the Valley to keep the bag of oats so that they would be able to shake them up again before the electors, and tell them that they had done all they possibly could, and that if they were only elected again they would do their best in the future.

Mr. ANNEAR said it was very amusing to listen to the hon. member who had just sat down. He spoke of squandering the money belonging to the people of the colony in the construction of railways, but the hon. gentleman must surely have forgotten the district he came from! He would like to know where the public money had been squandered, if

it was not on the railway from Bundaberg to Mount Perry. Why, in one little nook of a quarter of a mile along the line under discussion there were ten times as many people as there were likely to be in Mount Perry for years to come. That Mount Perry line was to settle people on the smiling homesteads the hon. gentleman talked about, and it did not pay working expenses. There were no people settled there, and there would be no people settled there for years to come, or while the hon. member lived. When the railway before them was under discussion last year he voted against it because it was not going to deep water.

Mr. STEVENSON : It is not going there now.

Mr. ANNEAR said he did not suppose that any member thought that the railway would pay by its passenger traffic, but what did they see? Did they not see that the coal trade from Ipswich and Bundamba had assumed such large proportions during the past twelve months that the Government had been compelled to expend £20,000 in the extension of wharves at South Brisbane to meet the traffic? He was confident that the coal trade would be the trade of this port, and before another twelve months were passed the Government would be called upon to spend another £20,000 to meet that traffic; and he asked how the money could be better spent than in making wharves or coal depôts at Bulimba to meet the traffic? A good many hon. members were conversant with New South Wales, and they would know that the Valley railway was almost in the same position as the railway which left Redfern and went down to Circular Quay by Goldsbrough's store, and which would probably be run round the harbour to meet the largely increasing traffic there. The railway before them might not pay at first, but, without taking into consideration the passenger traffic at all, he believed it would pay the cost of its outlay in a very few years. Since the line was last under discussion he had travelled a good deal about the western portion of the colony—as far as the railways went, and where heavy goods were shipped from time to time; and he challenged any hon. member to contradict what he was now going to say, and that was that at the present time the carriage of heavy goods from the wharves to the railway station at Brisbane cost as much as the freight on those goods from London to Brisbane.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No.

Mr. ANNEAR : I say, yes.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Bosh!

Mr. ANNEAR said he could get an engine brought from London to the wharf here as cheaply as he could get it taken from the wharf to the station here. When that was the state of affairs it was not the people of Fortitude Valley alone they should look to, but the whole of the people in the Western districts, and they should see that they had not to pay so much to get their goods shipped.

Mr. MURPHY: Hear, hear! Send out railways to them.

Mr. ANNEAR: The hon. member said "Send out railways to them," but he thought the railways had gone far enough out in the Central and Western districts of the colony. In spite of the fact that those gentlemen complained so much, the people of the colony had been making railways to their doors, and they were not satisfied now. The time had arrived when the members of that House should devote their attention to the construction of railways amongst the settled portions of the colony, where they would have, at any rate, some show of paying the interest upon the cost of their construction—not like the little line from Bundaberg to

Mount Perry. They must not allow the hon. member for Mulgrave to come there and talk about reckless expenditure. His memory was just as retentive as that of the hon. member, and he could well remember that there was no greater bogus railway, and no greater political railway ever made in the colony, than that railway from Bundaberg to Mount Perry. The railway before them was not by any means a political railway. There was another point to be considered. Had the people of New South Wales, some eight or ten years ago, purchased the land over which the line would have to pass from Redfern down to deep water, they could have purchased it 500 per cent. cheaper than they could at the present time; and, as there was a great deal of property to be purchased for the line now proposed, the Government could not commence the line at a better time than the present, when property was at a somewhat low ebb in Brisbane. He had never given a silent vote since he had been a member of the House; he did not intend to give one now, and he had therefore briefly given his reasons for supporting the railway.

Mr. FOOTE said he did not agree with the last speaker in the views he expressed in reference to the cost of carriage from the railway station to the wharf. The hon. member said that it cost as much to carry goods from the railway station to the vessel in Brisbane as to bring them from London to the colony.

Mr. ANNEAR: Heavy goods.

Mr. FOOTE said he could understand his argument as applied to the one article he mentioned—steam-engines. There was no doubt it did cost a very considerable sum of money to convey a steam-engine from the wharf to the railway station; but the argument did not apply to goods in general. Goods in general were carried at a very reasonable rate, and were carried really at a nominal cost when compared with the cost of freight from London. Neither did he agree with some hon. members that they could compare Sydney and Brisbane in respect of the distance of the railway station from the city. The railway station in Brisbane was quite near enough to the city, and in a few years' time it would be almost in the centre of the city, even though it might remain where it was. He was satisfied that if it was carried to the place contemplated in the amendment made by the hon. member for Stanley it would be in a more inconvenient position than it was now; and they should remember also that it would cost a great deal of money to provide ample room for a station there. They could not compare the distance of the station from Brisbane with that of the Redfern station from Sydney. The station there was a long way off—quite two and a-half miles from the centre of the city; and just the same thing applied to Melbourne. The railways there were a considerable distance from the centre of the city, although they might say that they had the railway running almost all round the city. To come to the point, the proposition before them involved a very great sum of money. The length of the line was comparatively very short, being only two miles and a-half, and to construct it would simply be making a second line of railway to run parallel with one that had already been made, and for which they had already had to pay. He did not say for a moment that the present line of railway accommodated the people living in the centre of Fortitude Valley; but, although they were not accommodated by that line, they had other very liberal accommodation. From almost any part of Fortitude Valley, by waiting on the footpath for a moment or two, they could be conveyed into town.

He thought the hon. member for Maryborough was somewhat astray when he spoke of the line being serviceable as a coal line; it never would be. They had been talking about a coal line to the Bulimba reach for the last twelve years, but he did not believe the Government had any idea of making the branch line marked on the plan to Bulimba reach. The line was to join the Sandgate line at Mayne, and all it would do would be to convey the same quantity of traffic and the same number of passengers as that line conveyed now, with the addition of those who might be taken on at Fortitude Valley. As for the goods traffic, the hon. member said that alone would make the line pay; but that could not possibly be. Though the line would be part of the main trunk line from the country, the goods traffic would not be sufficient to form a very great source of revenue to the country. Another view he took of the matter was the very heavy expense; he thought hon. members who said the line would cost £500,000 were speaking within bounds. He did not think the colony should try to get its name up to the same degree as some other colonies in the loan market at home. They had borrowed a very large sum of money, and it must be many years before they could go into the market for another loan. It would be some time before the present loan had all been placed on the market, and the moneys realised and used for the purpose for which they had been borrowed; and by passing that line they would bind any future Government to borrow money to carry it out. He thought that was a position they ought not to take up for some time. He liked to support hon. members when he could conscientiously do so; but in this instance he could not do violence to his conscience and the interests of the country by supporting the line. He would be compelled to support the hon. member for Stanley in his amendment, but he would rather see a direct vote against the entire motion, and have it defeated for the present.

Mr. ADAMS said the hon. member for Maryborough spoke of being amused by his (Mr. Adams's) statements; and he (Mr. Adams) could assure the Committee that he was frequently amused by the hon. member's statements long before he had the honour of a seat in that honourable House. The Minister for Works had distinctly stated that those who voted against the motion would be simply lunatics. Now, when the Bundaberg and Mount Perry Railway was passed, it was put through just as the present plans were tried to be put through. The first batch was brought in, and hon. members were told that the next would not be brought forward till those had been decided upon. They found that the Gladstone plans, which were placed on the table a long time ago, were not to take precedence in the next batch. Well, if they were lunatics who voted against this motion, perhaps the hon. member for Maryborough might consider that they were lunatics who voted for the Bundaberg and Mount Perry line. He would like to know who were the members at that time who voted for those plans. He (Mr. Adams) was not in the House, and he did not know whether the hon. member for Maryborough was; but he did know that when the plans were brought in the House was told that they must go through *in globo* or not go through at all. The gentlemen who were in the Ministry at that time, if he was not mistaken, were the Hon. John Douglas, the Hon. Sir Samuel Griffith, the present Minister for Works, and the Colonial Treasurer. Now, it would be quite as judicious for him to say that they were lunatics as for the Minister for Works now to say that members who voted against the Valley line would be

lunatic. He was very sorry the hon. member for Maryborough had walked out when he knew that he (Mr. Adams) was going to retaliate. He was quite satisfied that the expression of the hon. member for Maryborough was only a throw-out on account of a bogus line—the Mungar line; it was only a sprat to catch a mackerel. The people of the colony of Queensland were not able at the present time to throw away £150,000 a mile for a railway in the city of Brisbane.

Mr. W. BROOKES said he understood the Government were throwing out that list of railways as embodying their present works policy. That was all very well; but although he was, as hon. members opposite knew, a tolerably faithful supporter of the Government, he could never see why members on the Government side should be considered as obliged to support the whole of a list of railways, even though they were put forward as the policy of the Government. He held himself free to express an unbiased opinion on the vote before the Committee now, and he should endeavour to do so entirely on the merits of the case. He could not bring himself to see that it was a party vote in any sense of the word.

The PREMIER: It is on one side of the House—straight.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS of the Opposition: No.

Mr. BROOKES said the question arose, whether, if it were regarded as a party vote on the other side, he should also regard it as a party vote. He did not see that any political obligation rested on him to make a mistake because gentlemen on the opposite side did. It was his duty to the very important constituency he had the honour to represent, to vote according to the best of his judgment, and in no other way, especially in a matter of that kind. Now, the vote implied the expenditure of a very large sum of money, and he could not bring himself to think that that expenditure was justified in the present financial position of the colony, and he should have expected that the Colonial Treasurer would have said a word or two upon that aspect of the case. But perhaps the hon. gentleman was held in the trammels of what he might call "colleaguism." He could not but think that were he to speak his unbiased opinion he would say that he would rather that large expenditure were, at all events, deferred. Now, he (Mr. Brookes) also was unable to see any immediate necessity for the railway. When it was spoken of as being a connecting link with the North Coast line he saw that it might be. He saw that it was just possible that it might be, but it was quite time enough for them to face that large expenditure when the line from Gympie reached Mayne. That was the way he looked at it, and they might be in different circumstances then to what they were in now. He was very glad to hear the members for Fortitude Valley say that it was not a Valley railway. They both distinctly disclaimed the idea that it was a Valley railway, and he was glad because he had always believed that the opinion of a good many people in the Valley was that a railway would relieve them from all their distress. Now he might mention a conversation that he had at Christchurch, New Zealand, last year. He went into a draper's shop and the draper began to complain to him about the dullness of the times. He said times had been very bad for two years. He found out where he (Mr. Brookes) came from, and asked how things were in Brisbane. He told him they were getting on just middling, but nothing to boast of. "Well," said the draper, "unless things improve in Christchurch I shall have to go away;" and he (Mr. Brookes) advised him to wait for better times. He then went on

to make a statement which he (Mr. Brookes) had never forgotten. He said, "I tell you what I want. I want to see a railway made from Christchurch to Hokitika." That was a railway to go straight across the middle of New Zealand—across mountainous country such as they knew nothing of either in New South Wales or in this colony. He then went on to say that it would cost two millions of money; that whether it would pay or not was a matter he had not considered, and continued: "I know what it would do for me. It would cause a large expenditure in Christchurch, and would induce such a spurt in business that perhaps I might get into a good position and do well." "But," said he (Mr. Brookes), "you are leaning on a broken reed. When the money is spent, the contractors have bagged a big fortune, and the railway found not to pay—what then?" "Oh!" he said, "I have nothing to do with that." Now, whenever he (Mr. Brookes) heard of a railway being made to relieve a temporary financial distress, he always thought it was the most deceptive instrument that could be applied. In the long run nobody benefited but the contractors; the country made a bad bargain, the money which was circulated was soon spent, and then when the railway was made it was all over, and the dulness was almost greater than before. He quite agreed with any proposition that would bring a railway down to deep water, and if that railway promised to do anything in that shape he should not, he thought, be found voting for the amendment; but it did nothing of the kind. A railway to deep water would come in course of time, and he agreed with what had been said—that there was no immediate necessity for a railway to deep water. The present wharfage accommodation was pretty well equal to the requirements of the city of Brisbane at the present time, but, notwithstanding, if the proposed railway promised to be useful as a means of railway communication between Brisbane and deep water, his objections to it would not be such as they were now. He confessed he did not see the least utility in the proposed line if it was as a passenger railway. They knew very well that a great number of persons got out at Bowen Park, and they would get out there whether the railway were made or not. They certainly would not get out at Mayne. They would rather get out at Bowen Park than they would go to the Valley; consequently he was utterly unable to see what advantage it would be to the Valley in any shape or way whatever. As far as regarded the desire for the railway, he really did not believe, when matters were fairly and fully considered, that there would be any difference of opinion either among the Valley people or the city people. The fact was they were taking a step in the dark, and he thought, looking at the circumstances of the colony, prudence—financial prudence—would suggest that the line should be deferred until a more convenient time. That was the gist of what he had to say with reference to that line, and when the people of the Valley complained that Roma street was a long way from Fortitude Valley he could only point out, as had been pointed out previously, that there were similar instances, such as Melbourne and Sydney railways. The central station if in Queen street would be a nuisance; but removed to Creek street it would be an improvement; so that, between the two propositions, his choice was in favour of the amendment. He trusted he had made his reasons clear why he intended to vote for the amendment.

Mr. JORDAN said the member for North Brisbane had given a very bad illustration when he quoted the conversation that took place between himself and a shopkeeper in Christchurch. The argument used by the shopkeeper was that

the railway across New Zealand would bring custom to his shop, and he had no other reason to give; but the reason for the proposed Valley railway was that it would pay, and that was a very different thing. The one argument in favour of the line was that it passed through a densely populated part of the city and suburbs of this great town, and that it would pay, and if it would pay it would be a wise expenditure. He did not think he need go any further than that, but he would go a little further. The railway was promised two years ago; money was voted for it by the House; it was a part of the Government programme, and if it was voted against by the Government supporters, then the Government would be defeated. He was not in the House, unfortunately, when the question came on last session; he regretted that circumstances had prevented him from being present, but he had advocated the Government scheme being carried in its entirety. He foresaw that, if any part of the scheme was rejected when the loan was under consideration, the whole thing would tumble to pieces; and on that ground he thought it was right, if sufficient reasons could be given, that the Government party should vote together for the whole scheme. He took the same view of it now. He could quite understand hon. members on the other side opposing it; they wished to defeat the Government; but he could not for the life of him understand how any hon. members on his side could get up at that late hour of the matter, when the money had been voted and the scheme had been approved amongst other schemes by a large majority of the House, when the money had been borrowed for it, and when it had been promised to the people in the Valley—he could not understand how any hon. members on that side should help the Opposition to defeat the Government. The hon. member for Cook, Mr. Lumley Hill, gave some very fatherly advice to the members for South Brisbane, and as his colleague in the representation of that electorate was in the chair and could not speak, he should say a word to that hon. member in reply. The extension of the South Brisbane Railway to Melbourne street was also a part of the Government programme, and the Government promised that it should be carried out, although his constituents were very much dissatisfied that it was not laid on the table now like the other lines. Although the Government had given reasons why it should be deferred, those reasons were not sufficient to satisfy him, because he thought that if an effort had been made the plans might have been laid on the table with the others. Still the Government adhered to their promise that it should be made. It must be remembered that the railway promised to the Valley was a part of the Great Northern line—a part of the great national scheme of railways running from the southern boundary of the colony to the Gulf of Carpentaria. The city of Brisbane, with its population of 50,000, was the centre of that grand scheme. The Government did not propose to spend the £300,000 all at once; they only proposed to commence the line, which would be the most paying line in the colony. It was reasonable to suppose that the line would not cost more than £300,000, and they did not want to spend more than half that sum now. But the honour of the Government was pledged to it as part of their great scheme, and they on that side were in honour pledged to support it. It had been said that it would be necessary to continue the line to Bulimba to accommodate the great coal trade that was to be developed. He was as firm a believer in the development of the coal trade in Brisbane as anybody, but there was ample space at South Brisbane to accommodate all the ships that were likely to load with coal at the port. The Government had already commenced



to lengthen the coal wharf by 600 feet, and if that was not sufficient they could go down the river for 1,000 feet further, and that would accommodate all the coal trade the port was likely to have for the next twenty years. But the present proposal had nothing to do with Bulimba. It was part of a great scheme propounded by the Government—a necessary link in the great Northern line—and he was really astonished to hear hon. members say that it would afford no accommodation—would be of no advantage—to the city. It was an absurdity now that if a man wanted to go to Sandgate he had to get into a train in Roma street and be taken through Victoria Park. As he regarded the extension of the South Brisbane Railway to Melbourne street as a part of the Government scheme, he did not intend to injure the interests of South Brisbane by voting against the Government on the present question.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he wished to correct an error which the Premier seemed to have fallen into. The hon. gentleman interjected, when his hon. colleague (Mr. W. Brookes) was speaking, that it was being made a party question by the Opposition.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman was never more mistaken in his life. To make anything a party question a meeting must have been held to decide upon a plan of action. Certainly the Premier held a meeting of his supporters last Friday or Saturday morning, and tried to make it a party question, which he had failed to do; but no attempt had been made by the Opposition to make it a party question, and as far as he knew, members had not even consulted privately with each other on the subject. No one had consulted him on the question, and he had consulted nobody, and he was perfectly certain that the leader of the Opposition had not said anything to any member on that side about it. The question was being considered by them entirely on its merits. He even believed there were some hon. members on that side who would support the Government. In fact it was just as much a party question on one side as on the other, and that was not at all. The hon. member for South Brisbane seemed very much afraid that the Government would feel ill if they should be defeated that night; but on the last occasion when the Government were defeated on that question they seemed to bear that defeat very easily indeed; it did not affect them in the least. He was surprised that any hon. member outside the occupants of the Treasury bench should pretend to believe that the line would pay. It was ridiculous to expect any line to pay which would cost £150,000 per mile. Why, there was but one railway in the colony that had actually paid its working expenses and interest on the cost of construction from the time it was made. Let hon. members dismiss from their minds the idea of the Valley line being a paying line; it would not pay. He did not like the amendment, although he liked it a little more than the original motion. He was one of those who thought that, for the present at least, the existing terminus was sufficient to meet all requirements. He was in the constant habit of walking between the Parliamentary Buildings and the railway station, and he could do it easily without distressing himself in fifteen minutes, and he would walk from the railway station to the centre of Queen street in seven minutes. Yet they were told that it was in a very inconvenient position. It might be inconvenient for people living in the Valley; but, as had been pointed out, ample accommodation was provided from other sources—such as omnibuses and trams.

The tramway took people to within about 100 or 200 yards of the Bowen Park platform. What better accommodation could they have than that? Another reason why he disliked the amendment was this: that if they were to bring the railway to deep water they should first try and accommodate the wharves which they had already in existence about Petrie's Bight, and along what they usually called "the Brisbane wharves." If the amendment was carried it would preclude any possibility of that being done, because he agreed with the Premier that the grade would be too inconvenient; in fact, it would be impracticable to take the railway from what would be called "the central station," when it was made in Ann street, to the wharves at the river side. If they carried the amendment it would, as he had said, prevent the possibility of that being done in the future. Any extension for wharfage purposes must be further down the river towards Bulimba reach; so that he would prefer that both the proposition and the amendment should be negatived, and leave the matter of accommodation for shipping an open question for the future. A railway could, he believed, be taken from the present station down to the wharves at Petrie's Bight, but it certainly could not be taken from the one proposed by the hon. member for Stanley. Therefore, although probably he should vote for the amendment as the lesser evil of the two, he should prefer to have neither if he possibly could avoid it.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said if the suggestion of the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Jordan, was to be accepted or held to at all, they had been going in for a good deal of useless discussion. If the railways were to be bunched and shoved down their throats without being considered at all on their merits; if every hon. member had a railway—an axe of his own to grind, and was therefore going to vote for every one in the bill of fare, for fear their own would be jeopardised—it was a most contemptible state of things to arrive at in that Assembly. He, for one, had not the slightest wish or intention to jeopardise the position of the Government in any way. On the contrary, he was very anxious to keep them in their position, and was desirous of seeing them carry out works which would continue to keep them in the occupation of the Treasury benches not only during this Parliament but during the next. He would do all he could to assist them in that direction; but he was perfectly certain that if they were going to spend £300,000 or £400,000 on two miles of railway—although it was through a thickly populated part of the city—it would not find favour in the country districts. He was satisfied of that. At the same time, if the railways were to be bunched—if hon. members were going to vote for every one—they might as well pass them without further discussion, and go home. He quite agreed with the hon. member for South Brisbane when he said that the wharves on the south side, as they were now projected to be extended, and as they were capable of being extended in the future, were quite capable of accommodating the whole of the coal traffic that came down the South Brisbane line. It had been contended that it would be necessary at some future time that the coal trade should go to Bulimba. That argument had been used by some hon. members—that the line would carry goods and coal down to the Bulimba reach; but there was not the slightest necessity for coal to be carried there when it could be carried to the wharf at South Brisbane with much greater facility, and without interfering very much with any other trade. He thought the remarks made by the Minister for Works to the effect that railways should be made regardless of cost—that



they had a great big country behind them, any amount of money, and any amount of prosperity, and all that kind of thing—were not at all borne out by the facts of the times. With regard to Sydney, no doubt they were acting regardless of cost in endeavouring to bring the railway from Redfern to the Circular Quay, but at the same time they knew that the finances of New South Wales were in an almost hopeless state of entanglement. He did not wish to see the Government here involved in the meshes of any difficulties of that kind. He could see perfectly plainly that they had got hard times before them, and they should take very good care that every shilling and every pound they laid out now should, as far as possible, be expended in thoroughly reproductive works, and not in works of this nature, which merely gave additional accommodation to people who were already very well accommodated. It was a luxury, and a very expensive luxury. As for making amends for the way in which the Valley line was carried out before, he was of opinion that it had been carried the wrong way, but it had taken the people that way and there was quite sufficient population to make it a good paying line as it was. He really did not see why the Valley should have two lines. The two members for the Valley said the line was not theirs, and they advocated their cause very well and very persistently, but he had heard very few persons outside the Valley support them, except, of course, the Ministry. He had heard no good sound reasons for what little support had been accorded them. It seemed to him that this line would be a regular wanton waste of public money, doing very little good to anybody beyond those within the precincts of the city, and really to only a very limited number of these. It was nothing in the shape of a colonial work at all.

Mr. FOXTON said, as one of those who voted against a similar Government proposal last session, he did not feel inclined to give a silent vote on the present occasion, but he should not occupy the time of the Committee very long. He thought before going into the argument, *pro* or *con.*, a mistake had been made by one hon. member, at least, on the other side which should be corrected. It had been stated that the line, if passed, would mop up, so to speak, one-twentieth of the £10,000,000 loan. That was a delusion into which that hon. member had fallen. Even supposing that the line ultimately cost half-a-million of money, it would not take that sum out of the £10,000,000 loan, because only £175,000 of the £10,000,000 loan was available for the purpose. He thought it necessary that that should be put clearly before the Committee. He had just been informed that it was one fifty-seventh of the loan, instead of one-twentieth; he had not worked it out for himself. It was apparently the opinion of the majority of the Committee that the line should be carried into the heart of the city—that the amendment of the hon. member for Stanley should be carried. He believed that that proposition had the sanction of the majority so far—that it was common ground upon which some opponents of the scheme and those who supported it as a whole were prepared to meet. That being so, he thought that it would follow as a necessary corollary that the line must be taken through and join the Sandgate line at some future time. Then it was simply a matter of time. That they should have a central station at Ann street, and that it would remain there for all time, was an absurdity on the face of it, and it then became a necessity for them to consider where they could best take it. Last year he was under the impression, induced by the arguments of the then member for Fortitude Valley, the late

Mr. Beattie, that a better route than the one proposed might be found. Of course, it had been remarked that the two members for the Valley had then differed in their views, and it was natural that those whose constituents were not interested and who looked at it from a national point of view—as representatives, so to speak, of the whole body of electors—should vote in such a way as to give the Committee an opportunity of reconsidering the matter, and seeing whether some other line could not be devised which would meet all requirements. But now the matter had been thoroughly considered, and he was entirely of opinion that the proposed line was the best which could be adopted. He was at one time strongly in favour of the route to Petrie's Bight. That was a very taking scheme; but he learned that, although it was possible to get down from the Roma-street station at a gradient of 1 in 66 to Petrie's Bight, there was the level for the city station to be taken out of that, which would increase the grade and make it steeper. The main objection was that there was not room enough for a decent-sized, good station. He was told that at the Roma-street station they were already cramped for room. At all events they knew the space which was occupied by the building and the sidings at Roma street, and they also knew there was not one-tenth of that available at Petrie's Bight—even for the Roma-street station as it now stood. Another thing was that he really did not see that it mattered very much whether the amendment were carried or the original motion, because, as he said before, if the amendment were carried it would necessitate the carrying out of the Government proposal either now or at some future time. It was also admitted that there was only £175,000 available, and that would probably be very little more than would be required for constructing the portion of the line which the hon. member for Stanley proposed to construct now. It had been admitted all round that the present line to Sandgate, forming part of the North Coast line, as it went out from Brisbane was a mistake—that it had gone out in a wrong direction, and that in going to Sandgate it described more than half-a-circle. How much worse would that be when that was the main line going up the North Coast! And how much more would that absurdity be aggravated if the line were carried into the centre of the city at Ann street and had to go right away in an opposite direction to get on to the North Coast Railway! For those reasons he felt bound to vote for the proposal of the Government in its entirety.

Mr. MURPHY said it was not his intention to say much at that late hour of the night upon the amendment. He simply rose to deny a statement made by the Premier, that he was going to give a party vote upon the question. He was not going to give a party vote; but he would simply vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Stanley, because no good or valid argument had been brought forward by the Government or their supporters sufficiently strong to induce him to vote for the proposal as it stood. There had been no statistics or figures quoted in support of the railway by the Government. They simply made a bald assertion that the line would cost a certain sum of money, without supporting that assertion by statistics. They gave the Committee no idea as to what the cost of the resumption of land would be. They knew that there was £175,000 only voted for the railway, and he was afraid if they once authorised the line the Government would go on with it, no matter what the cost might be. Not only would that £175,000 be spent, but a great deal more, if once the line was authorised. There was no doubt the resumption of the land would cost an enormous

sum of money; and, although it was said that by putting a tunnel through the hill they would save a certain amount of money, the Government would find that the people under whose lands that tunnel went would all require compensation. One of the hon. members for Fortitude Valley—Mr. Brooks—stated that he claimed the votes of members on the Opposition side of the Committee because, upon looking round, and critically examining their faces and personal appearance, he thought they were too intelligent, and too well-dressed, and too gentlemanly not to vote for it. But he (Mr. Murphy) thought they had a little more intelligence and gentlemanly feeling than the hon. member gave them credit for. They had a great deal too much intelligence and gentlemanly feeling to vote for the line. He was sure there were several hon. members on the Government side of the Committee who had quite as much gentlemanly feeling and intelligence as hon. members on his side, and who had too much intelligence to be trapped by that kind of chaff to vote for a political line. One of those hon. gentlemen who were so keen in their advocacy of the line, which, they said, was not a Fortitude Valley line, stated that members supporting the Government were bound to vote for the line, because it was one of those mentioned in the loan vote, the line mentioned being "A line for Fortitude Valley." But the hon. members for the Valley disclaimed that it was a line to Fortitude Valley at all; therefore, upon that ground they could not claim the votes, even from their own side of the Committee. In regard to the necessity for having a more central station than the one they had at present, he did not think any city—as had been said by hon. members already—in Australia was more conveniently situated in regard to its railway station than Brisbane. In Melbourne it was a great deal further to go from Spencer street to any portion of the business part of the city, than to go from the present railway terminus in Brisbane to the business part of that city; and in Sydney they had a great deal further to go—twice or three times the distance that they had in Brisbane. There was another thing. Did the Government suppose that Brisbane was going to remain as it was now? Did they suppose that little street—Queen street—from Petrie's Bight to Victoria Bridge, was to remain always the centre of Brisbane? Brisbane had got no room to extend on the river side, so it would extend beyond the railway station, and the business parts would draw up towards the railway line; and in a very short time they would find that the present railway terminus would be in the very heart of the city. He quite agreed with those hon. gentlemen who argued that by taking the railway down towards Bulimba they would be doing an injury to those persons who owned property in Queen street and in other portions of Brisbane as it was now, and would be doing an injury to the present wharf owners, and to the merchants who built warehouses there in the expectation that the traffic would never be taken away. The building of a railway in the direction shown by the sketch on the map towards Bulimba would in a very short time draw away the trade from the more central portions of the city, because land would be cheaper down there, and they could carry on some of their business operations perhaps at less cost in the first instance; and it would be a very serious injury to property owners who had invested large sums of money in wharves and huge buildings on the present sites on the river. The hon. the Premier had used the argument that the suburban traffic would be a very profitable one, and that suburban was the most profitable traffic in some of the other colonies. So far as the suburban traffic about

1886—4 L

Melbourne was concerned, he knew that it was the least profitable of the whole traffic carried on the Victorian railways, although that suburban traffic was carried through all the most populous portions of the city and suburbs. The suburban traffic in Victoria was not paying interest on the money invested on those railways, nor was it likely to do so for many years to come, whereas the traffic from the country districts in Victoria was more than paying interest on the money expended in constructing those railways. He should vote for the amendment.

Mr. ANNEAR said it was somewhat remarkable if the suburban railways round Melbourne paid so badly that the Government gave an enormous price to a company so that they might have the whole of them in their own hands.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR said he was sorry that he had not been present in the Chamber when the hon. member for Mulgrave was going to annihilate him. He had to go to the steamer "Derwent" with his friend Mr. Mellor to see some friends off, and did not hear the hon. member for Mulgrave; but this he would say, if he could not bear the force of that hon. gentleman's steel he would be unworthy to represent the important electorate he had the honour of now doing. He could assure the hon. gentleman that he should be ashamed of himself, and especially his constituents would be of him, when that hon. member was able to annihilate him. He thought the hon. member for Carnarvon had struck the nail on the head when he said let any hon. members go up to Roma street and see the small space there was for carrying on the Southern and Western trade at the present time. And yet they were going to add the trade of the whole of the Northern railways to Brisbane to that.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. ANNEAR: The hon. member for the Barcoo said they must not look at the Brisbane of to-day; they must look at the Brisbane of ten, fifteen, or twenty years hence. He quite agreed with that. At present at the goods sheds at the Roma-street station they had to delay receiving goods until the day they were sent away, as there was not storage room for them there. He voted for the proposed line in all sincerity, and there was no bunting about it. It was said that the lines were being bunched. Nothing of the kind. Every railway the Government were putting before the Committee were on their own merits, and on its own merits would hon. members judge and vote accordingly. He was opposed to and spoke strongly against the proposed railway last year. But he was one of those who lived to learn, and he had learned since twelve months ago that he gave what he now believed to be a vote in the wrong direction. He would remove the effect of that wrong vote as far as possible, and vote for the resolution.

Mr. MACFARLANE said, as he intended to vote for the railway, he would give some reasons to the Committee why he voted against it that time last year.

Mr. STEVENSON: We all understand!

Mr. MACFARLANE said that when the line was before the Committee last year the two Valley members were divided. That was his first reason for voting against it last year. He thought when two members representing one constituency were divided the Committee could do nothing better than vote against it, so that it might come up again for decision. Another reason was that at that time he really did not know the relative positions of the two routes

then proposed. The late member for the Valley proposed an alternative route, which he said was much better than the one proposed by the Government, and he was really not in a position to decide which was the best. But having studied the matter since then, he had every reason to suppose that the proposed railway was one he could reasonably vote for without stultifying himself in the matter. One hon. member said that the money that would be wasted on that railway would make 100 miles of railway in the country, but he found that those very gentlemen—he begged pardon—those very members were the ones that opposed such a country railway as the *via recta*. If the money was to go from the Valley to make the *via recta* instead, would they support that country railway? No; they were the members who would oppose both. For those reasons he intended to vote for the Valley railway.

Mr. STEVENSON: What reasons? You have given us no reasons.

Mr. MACFARLANE said the hon. member for Normanby, Mr. Stevenson, perhaps knew his reasons better than he did himself. The hon. member knew everybody's mind better than his own.

Mr. STEVENSON: You have not given your reasons for this railway.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he had not given them yet. He had given the reasons why he voted against the railway before, and now he would give his reasons for voting for it that night. It would join the Southern and Western Railway with the Great Northern Railway.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACFARLANE said that was the very best reason, and he thought every member who voted against the proposed railway was stultifying himself. The hon. member for Normanby and the hon. member for Cook had said that they were going to vote for the railway coming into the centre of the town. Every person knew that if it came to the centre of the town it must go to the extremity.

Mr. STEVENSON said he never said anything of the sort.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that everyone who spoke against the Valley railway said he would be quite willing to bring the railway into the centre of the town. If they brought it to the centre it must go further; it could not stop there. They would be simply doing a half, but the whole must be made some day. For those reasons, which he thought very good ones, he would vote for the Valley railway.

Mr. ALAND said he had not intended to speak on the matter, but there had been so much talk by members generally on his side of the Committee about stultification, that he felt he really ought to say something. He had voted against that railway when it was before the Committee last year, and he was going to vote against it that evening, and he did not think that he was stultifying himself in any way because he gave a sort of passive assent to the loan proposals of the Government in the year 1884. He would like to point out to the Committee that they were to a certain extent deluded by the Government with those Loan Estimates. The cost of the Brisbane and Ipswich duplication was set down at £85,000.

Mr. ANNEAR: On account.

Mr. ALAND said there was nothing about "on account." They were simply told that the duplication would cost £85,000. But what did they find now? That the cost would be nearer £200,000 than £85,000. It had already cost

£120,000 or £130,000, and any member going along that line would see that there was a large amount of work still to be done. He thought the Government ought to be obliged to hon. members for trying to oppose their proposals. They knew the Government were bound to bring them forward, and they as sensible men, not as lunatics, as the Minister for Works tried to make them out to be, tried to prevent some of them being carried. If they went on spending the £7,000,000 of their £10,000,000 loan for such lines as those, they would require £14,000,000 more before the railway proposals of the Government would in any way be completed. In reference to the Fortitude Valley line, the sum set down for that on the Loan Estimates was £175,000. He was sure that members would never have consented to vote for that if the Government had told them that instead of £175,000 it would cost £500,000. And that was what the line would cost.

Mr. McMASTER: No.

Mr. ALAND said the member for Fortitude Valley, who stated that it was his own line, said it would not cost £500,000. He (Mr. Aland) said it would, and he had as much right to say it would as the hon. member had to say it would not.

Mr. McMASTER: How do you know?

Mr. ALAND said he believed it would cost that amount. When that line was before the Committee last year, the Government were asked what was the estimated amount of compensation that would have to be paid for the land to be resumed for the railway. They could not tell. What position were they in now—twelve months afterwards? They could not tell even now what the cost of land resumption would be. He considered the Government ought to be able to tell; they ought to be able to give the Committee a very good idea of what the resumption of the land would cost. But they could do, or would do, nothing of the sort. Yet members on that side of the Committee had tried to force it down his throat that he would be stultifying himself by voting against the proposals of the Government. He distinctly stated, when they brought forward their railway proposals, that he held himself free to vote against any one of them if he chose, and he should certainly do so. He regarded that line as one which was not wanted. He did not believe in the amendment of the hon. member for Stanley. He would far rather see the line thrown out altogether. They did not want the railway brought into Creek street. The Government, when that railway was before the Committee on a previous occasion, stated that it was to be a passenger station. But what did they find now? From the hon. member for Maryborough, who appeared to be in the secrets of the Government, they learned that they were to have a goods shed and an expensive station. Was that to be done for £175,000? Nothing of the sort. His experience of the present station had been different from the experience of most hon. members on that point, and he was often at the station. He did not see any want of room there nor any crush. He took a friend there on one occasion and he said, "Dear me, what a dead and alive place it is!" Of course, he was from Sydney. The railway station in Roma street would answer all their purposes for a long time to come. The Fortitude Valley railway line was purely a matter of convenience; it was not a matter of necessity, and in times like the present he contended it was necessitous works, and not lines for the mere convenience of a few of the travelling public which should be undertaken. The Premier had said that the line would pay. He (Mr. Aland) could not, for the life of him, see how it was going to pay. It was not a line

which would increase traffic. They were told that it was a through line to the North coast ; but it would not increase traffic on that particular line. Then they were told that it was a suburban line to meet the Sandgate line ; but that would not increase traffic on the Sandgate line. How then was the traffic to be increased, and how was the interest on that expensive line to be met ? He thought it would simply be a waste of money at the present time to incur the expenditure which that railway would involve. When the railway returns were falling off in the manner in which they had done, and when the Treasurer had come down to that House with a very heavy deficit, it was too bad for the Government to try and force a line like that on the Committee. Why did not the Government, one and all of them, get up and defend the line ?

The PREMIER : Because we should only be repeating what has been already said.

Mr. ALAND : Because they could not.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he wished to say a word or two more on the subject. He thought a line of that sort should be referred to a select committee who were unprejudiced in the matter. He was aware that there was a committee of the sort in the Council, and he did hope that this time they would very carefully discharge their duty. He believed it would be a good thing if all lines of that kind were referred to a select committee ; it was so in the House of Commons.

Mr. FOXTON : They are private lines there, and constructed under private Bills.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said it would have the effect of taking away the political element which entered into matters of that kind. He was perfectly well aware that the hon. member for Carnarvon had his own little "axe to grind." Very likely he was like the hon. member for South Brisbane, who was very much afraid that his Melbourne-street terminus would not be effected if he voted against the railway for Fortitude Valley. He maintained that the whole of the arguments that had been advanced that evening showed that the Fortitude Valley line was the most expensive and extravagant luxury they could possibly indulge in at the present time.

Mr. FOXTON said he was sorry that his suggestion that the lines dealt with in the House of Commons were constructed by private individuals under private Bills should have caused the hon. member for Cook to accuse him of having an "axe to grind." The hon. gentleman surely forgot that he himself had shown that he was personally interested in blocking the Fortitude Valley line when he said he had a very large interest in the city. Was he an hon. member to accuse somebody else of having an "axe to grind" ? Did he mean to say that he (Mr. Foxtton) had a personal interest in that line ? He did not know what the hon. member meant when he said he had an "axe to grind," and he indignantly denied that he had an "axe to grind."

Mr. LUMLEY HILL : The Warwick and St. George Railway.

Mr. FOXTON said if he did desire that line it was certainly not as big an "axe to grind" as the hon. member had. At all events, he would support it, because he believed it was for the good of the country. He certainly had no personal interest whatever in the matter, and it was not the only one he intended to support. There were several others which he would vote for ; he had already voted for two or three that evening—at any rate he did not oppose them. That was not because he had any more connection with those lines than he had with the one now before the Committee.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question—put, and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 26.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Rutledge, Miles, Dickson, Dutton, Moreton, Bulcock, Smyth, Mellor, Isambert, Jordan, White, Buckland, McMaster, Kates, Wakefield, S. W. Brooks, Salkeld, Stevens, Sheridan, Foxton, Annear, Bailey, Higson, Macfarlane, and Horwitz.

NOES, 25.

Messrs. Norton, Chubb, Macrossan, Jessop, Foote, Aland, Lumley Hill, Campbell, Lalor, Black, Stevenson, Kellett, Pattison, Govett, Donaldson, Nelson, Palmer, Lissner, Philp, W. Brooks, Murphy, Wallace, Adams, Hamilton, and McWhannell.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Original question put, and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 25.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Rutledge, Miles, Dickson, Dutton, Moreton, Sheridan, Foxton, Stevens, Salkeld, S. W. Brooks, Kates, Wakefield, McMaster, Annear, Buckland, White, Jordan, Isambert, Mellor, Smyth, Bulcock, Bailey, Horwitz, and Macfarlane.

NOES, 25.

Messrs. Norton, Chubb, Macrossan, Palmer, Donaldson, Adams, McWhannell, Hamilton, Jessop, Aland, Lissner, Philp, Kellett, Govett, Foote, Pattison, Stevenson, Black, Lalor, Nelson, Campbell, Lumley Hill, Wallace, Higson, and Murphy.

The CHAIRMAN : There being a tie, it rests with me to give my casting vote. I am not going to say how I should vote if my vote determined the question and prevented its further consideration ; but, as the final issue rests in another place, I shall give my vote with the "Ayes," and the question is therefore resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. STEVENSON : Such a thing was never done in this House before.

On the motion of the MINISTER FOR WORKS, the House resumed, and the CHAIRMAN reported the resolution to the House.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved that the resolution be now adopted by the House.

Question put, and the House divided :—

AYES, 26.

Sir S. W. Griffith, Messrs. Rutledge, Dickson, Dutton, Miles, Moreton, Foxton, Stevens, Sheridan, Salkeld, McMaster, S. W. Brooks, Kates, Wakefield, Annear, Buckland, White, Jordan, Isambert, Mellor, Bulcock, Smyth, Fraser, Bailey, Horwitz, and Macfarlane.

NOES, 25.

Messrs. Norton, Chubb, Macrossan, Hamilton, Aland, Black, Adams, Nelson, Lalor, Jessop, Campbell, Kellett, Pattison, Stevenson, Lissner, Govett, Philp, Palmer, Wallace, Higson, Murphy, McWhannell, Lumley Hill, Foote, and Donaldson.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

## ADJOURNMENT.

### CHAIRMAN'S CASTING VOTE.

The PREMIER said : Mr. Speaker,—I move that this House do now adjourn. It is proposed to-morrow to go on with the remaining motions standing in the name of the Minister for Works, and if they are disposed of early in the evening, as I hope they will be, the business will then stand on the paper in the same order as to-day.

Mr. STEVENSON said : Mr. Speaker,—I wish to explain why I called out "Divide" just now. I called for a division thinking that the Chairman of Committees would have the decency after the vote he gave in the last division—such a vote as that was never given in this House

before by the Chairman of Committees, who has always, when a tie has taken place, especially on a money matter, given his vote so as to leave the question open to further consideration—I say I called for a division, thinking the Chairman of Committees would at any rate have the decency to walk out of the Chamber, and leave the matter to your decision, as he should have done, instead of giving a vote on party grounds. Whatever interest you might have in the railways, I am perfectly satisfied that you would have given your decision in another way than that in which the Chairman of Committees did.

The PREMIER said : Mr. Speaker,—I rise to defend an officer of the House, who has been unjustly attacked. It is a very unusual thing for hon. members to get up and abuse an officer of the House because they do not agree with the way he has given his vote. The Chairman of Committees gave his vote in strict accordance with parliamentary practice. A resolution adopted in committee has to be reported to the House and has no effect unless it is adopted by the House, and the Chairman of Committees was perfectly right, therefore—he was acting perfectly in accordance with precedent—in giving his casting vote so that the question might be considered by the House. By voting in any other way he would have prevented the House from deciding the question. It is not usual to discuss the Chairman's action in this way, but, an attack having been made, I thought it my duty to take notice of it.

Mr. NORTON said : Mr. Speaker,—I do not propose to discuss the question, but I do say that the argument brought forward by the leader of the Government might be met very easily, because many questions that might be decided in the same way are not decided by the House. However, I think it would be just as well if we adjourned amicably.

Mr. FRASER said : Mr. Speaker,—I think it will be admitted by hon. members on both sides of the House that whenever I have been called upon to give a casting vote I have acted in an impartial manner.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

Mr. FRASER : I knew the vote I was giving was not deciding the question ; it was leaving it open to be decided elsewhere. Besides that, I was perfectly in order. According to the practice of the House of Commons neither the Chairman of Committees nor the Speaker is called upon to assign any reason whatever for the vote he gives. They are at liberty to give the vote according to their own opinion, whatever effect it may have upon the question before the House.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said : Before you put the motion for adjournment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government a question. We were told when the hon. Minister for Works placed this batch of railway plans on the table, that when some progress—or considerable progress, I am not certain which—was made with this batch, the second would be laid on the table. Can the second batch not be laid on the table to-morrow so as to expedite business? We have made some progress to-night ; so far, all the railways the Government have proposed this evening have been carried. That is considerable progress ; about half the batch has been wiped off ; and I would like the hon. gentleman to answer that question before we adjourn.

The PREMIER said : Mr. Speaker,—I asked my hon. colleague the same question a few minutes ago—whether those plans could be laid on the table to-morrow—because I thought it very

desirable that it should be done, if possible. My hon. colleague informs me that one or two of them are not quite ready, but as soon as they are he will lay them all on the table.

Mr. ALAND said : Mr. Speaker,—I might throw out the suggestion that if all the plans referred to by the Minister for Works last week are not ready, he might bring forward the Drayton deviation, which, I know, has been ready in his office for some time.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at seventeen minutes past 10 o'clock.