

(No. 143.)



1886.

PARLIAMENT OF TASMANIA.

PAYMENT OF SURVEYS:

**REPORT FROM THE SELECT COMMITTEE, WITH MINUTES OF
THE PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE.**

Brought up by Mr. Bird, and ordered by the House of Assembly to be printed,
December 2, 1886.



SELECT COMMITTEE appointed, on Thursday, the 28th October, to enquire into the Allegations made by MR. GEORGE INNES in his Petition received by this House on the 14th October, and to enquire into the whole system of Payment for Surveys of the Waste Lands of the Crown.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE.

MR. DOOLEY.
MR. SUTTON.
MR. FENTON.
MR. HARTNOLL.

MR. MACKENZIE.
MR. CONWAY.
MR. BIRD. (*Mover.*)

DAYS OF MEETING.

Thursday, 4th November; Friday, 5th November; Thursday, 11th November; Friday, 12th November; Wednesday, 17th November; Friday, 26th November; Wednesday, 1st December; Thursday, 2nd December.

WITNESSES EXAMINED.

Mr. W. M. Hardy, Inspector of Surveys; Mr. Geo. Innes, Surveyor; Mr. C. P. Sprent, Deputy Surveyor-General; Mr. Herbert Coombes, District Surveyor; Mr. E. A. Counsel, District Surveyor.

WITNESSES' EXPENSES.

Mr. G. Innes, £5 7s.; Mr. H. Chalmers, £1 11s.; Mr. E. A. Counsel, £4 4s.; Mr. H. C. Coombes, £1 17s.

R E P O R T.

Your Committee have the honor to report to your Honorable House that they have held eight sittings, and examined five witnesses.

The evidence taken discloses the fact that, prior to the issue of the Regulations now in force for the guidance of surveyors, surveys were very frequently effected in a rough and unsatisfactory manner, the surveyors, in some cases, evidently being controlled less by the purpose to make a satisfactory survey than by the desire to make the fees payable afford a good remuneration for the work done.

Mr. Innes, without hesitation, admitted in his evidence that, regarding his district as an exceptionally rough one, he has been compelled, in order to earn anything like fair payment for his work, to do it much less carefully than he otherwise would have wished to do it.

Your Committee believe that, owing to the absence of field inspection and proper office check in former years, very much indifferent work has been passed and paid for; and that, in consequence of such laxity so long prevailing, there has been more dissatisfaction with the present rates of payment under the new Regulations than there would have been if a better class of work, such as should have been insisted on in former years, had been done.

Your Committee are satisfied that, generally, much better work is performed under the system of inspection now in operation; and that the question of increased payment which has been raised by Mr. Innes is one that requires consideration.

The difference between the work a surveyor is now required to do, and that which for many years was allowed to pass, is variously estimated by the surveyors your Committee have examined at from 25 to 100 per cent. additional; and there is a concurrence of opinion, not only among the surveyors themselves, but also on the part of the Deputy Surveyor-General and the Inspector of Surveys, that the fees as at present fixed are inadequate for the class of work required to be done.

Your Committee have carefully considered the claim of Mr. Innes that the Huon District should be regarded as exceptionally rough, and on that account that higher survey fees should be paid there; but your Committee, guided by the evidence before them, have come to the conclusion that while in years gone by the Huon may have been, as compared with some districts, exceptionally rough, it cannot be so regarded now, in view of the fact that the bulk of the more open land of the Colony has been alienated, and that the lands of the Scottsdale and North West Coast districts, where settlement is more rapidly progressing, are quite as rough as the country of the Huon.

Your Committee cannot therefore recommend the payment of any higher fees for the Huon than for other districts: but they do feel that, for such work as is now required, the surveyors in all districts are entitled to higher fees than are now paid.

Whether such increase in the survey fees shall be paid by the selectors, or charged in common with road surveys, &c. to the General Revenue, is a question to which your Committee has given some consideration. It is felt, on the one hand, that the selectors of the heavily scrubbed and timbered land are sufficiently burdened already by survey fees and other payments for the land, and that, on the other hand, it would scarcely be fair to burden the whole of the taxpayers with such additional charges as increased survey fees for private selections. So long as the present system is in force, which throws the cost of surveys after selection on the selectors, it appears that they should bear the whole cost of the survey of the lots they select; and though reluctant to increase the charge to selectors, your Committee feel that, in justice to surveyors, there is nothing left for them but to recommend that such increased fees as may be determined on shall be paid by the selectors.

In conclusion, your Committee have the honor to recommend that the present scale of survey fees under the Waste Lands Act be increased by 20 per cent., such increase to be applicable to all districts in the Colony alike: always provided that all surveys shall be carried out to the satisfaction of the Department.

B. S. BIRD, *Chairman.*

Committee Room, Thursday, 2nd December, 1886.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1886.

The Committee met at 3 P.M.

Present—Mr. M'Kenzie, Mr. Sutton, Mr. Dooley, Mr. Bird.

Mr. Bird was voted to the Chair.

The Chairman tabled a copy of Mr. Innes' Petition. (*Vide* Appendix A.)

Resolved, that the following witnesses be summoned :—Mr. G. Innes, Franklin, Wednesday next, at 11 A.M.; Mr. Hardy, Inspector of Surveys, Friday next, at 11:30 A.M.; Messrs. A. Reid and C. Sprent on dates to be hereafter determined.

The Committee adjourned till Friday next, at 11:30 A.M.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1886.

The Committee met at 12:10 P.M.

Present—Mr. Bird (Chairman), Mr. Dooley, Mr. M'Kenzie, Mr. Fenton, and Mr. Conway.

Mr. Wentworth Marmaduke Hardy, Inspector of Surveys, attended, and was examined.

Mr. Hardy withdrew.

At 3:50 P.M. the Committee adjourned till 11 o'clock on Wednesday next.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1886.

The Committee met at 11:10 P.M.

Present—Mr. Bird (Chairman), Mr. Dooley, and Mr. Sutton.

Mr. Geo. Innes was called and examined.

Mr. Innes withdrew.

The Committee adjourned at 1:5 P.M. till 11 o'clock next day.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1886.

The Committee met at 11 A.M.

Present—Mr. Bird (Chairman), Mr. M'Kenzie, and Mr. Sutton.

The Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Mr. W. M. Hardy, Inspector Surveys, was called and examined.

Mr. Hardy withdrew.

Mr. C. P. Sprent, Deputy Surveyor-General, was called and examined.

Mr. Sprent withdrew.

At 1:5 P.M. the Committee adjourned till 2:30 P.M.

The Committee reassembled at 2:30 P.M., when Mr. H. C. Chalmers, District Surveyor of Deloraine, was called and examined.

At 4 P.M. the Committee adjourned till 11 A.M. on Wednesday.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1886.

The Committee met at 11:15 A.M.

Present—Mr. Bird (Chairman), Mr. Dooley, Mr. M'Kenzie, and Mr. Conway.

The Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Mr. Herbert Coombes, District Surveyor, was examined.

Mr. Coombes withdrew.

Mr. Edward Albert Counsel, District Surveyor, was called and examined.

Mr. Counsel withdrew.

It was resolved that Mr. C. P. Sprent, Deputy Surveyor-General, be asked to furnish a Return showing the number of District Surveyors and the amount of Fees paid annually to each Surveyor for the years 1883, 1884, and 1885; also the number of Assistants each Surveyor employed during that period, and the amount paid annually to each Assistant.

The Committee adjourned till Friday, 26th November.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1886.

The Committee met at 11 A.M.

Present—Mr. Bird (Chairman), Mr. Hartnoll, Mr. Dooley.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The Chairman tabled the following documents (Appendix B). :—

1. Memo. from Mr. C. P. Sprent, Deputy Surveyor-General, *re* Mr. Innes' case.
2. Letter, dated 29th September, 1886, from Mr. G. Innes to the Deputy Surveyor-General.
3. Letter, dated 23rd September, 1886, from Mr. G. Innes to the Hon. the Minister of Lands.
4. Letter, dated 2nd October, 1886, from Mr. Hardy, Inspector of Surveys.
5. Statement of the cost of certain Surveys, from the Inspector of Surveys.

The Chairman tabled the Victorian scale of Survey Fees (Appendix C.)

The Clerk was directed to send certain written questions to Mr. R. Hall, Surveyor, Hamilton-on-Forth.

The Committee adjourned till Wednesday, 1st December next, at 11 A.M.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1886.

The Committee met at 11 A.M.

Present—Mr. Bird (Chairman), Mr. Fenton, Mr. Dooley, Mr. Conway.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

A Memo. from Mr. Sprent was received, stating that he was unable to say whether the slip submitted to him was a correct copy of the Victorian Scale of Survey Fees or otherwise.

The replies to questions forwarded to Mr. Hall, Surveyor, Hamilton-on-Forth, were received (Appendix D.)

Mr. Conway withdrew.

The consideration of the Draft Report was proceeded with.

The Committee adjourned until Thursday, the 2nd December, at 11 A.M.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1886.

The Committee met at 11 A.M.

Present—Mr. Bird (Chairman), Mr. Dooley, and Mr. Fenton.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The Draft Report was agreed to.

The Committee adjourned *sine die*.

EVIDENCE.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1886.

MR. WENTWORTH MARMADUKE HARDY, *examined*.

1. *By the Chairman*.—What is your position? I am Inspector of Surveys.
2. How long have you held that position? Since 1st February, 1884.
3. *By Mr. Dooley*.—Have you any other position than that of Inspector of Surveys? I also act as professional adviser to the Department. I was appointed to carry out Mr. Black's scheme. My appointment was made by the Governor-in-Council. (Appointment produced.)
4. *By Mr. Mackenzie*.—Were you appointed to act in conjunction with Mr. Black? No. My appointment was the result of Mr. Black's report, and subsequent to it.
5. *By the Chairman*.—You say you have been appointed to carry out Mr. Black's recommendations? Yes.
6. Was there any commencement made to carry out his recommendations before your appointment? I do not think so. I have no power to make alterations without the consent of the Deputy Surveyor-General. I recommend, but cannot act without his consent. Certain regulations were drawn up after my appointment, and surveyors were directed to conform to them.
7. The department did not entirely adopt Mr. Black's recommendations? No. In my first annual report I pointed out that the fees were lower, and that there was no provision made for allowance for mileage as Mr. Black advocated.
8. What are the principal alterations that have been made since you entered upon your office? The marking is much better. The marks are of a more permanent character, and are made in such a way that we can discover the accuracy of the surveys years afterwards.
9. Perhaps it would be as well for you to put in the regulations? Yes; I herewith hand in a copy of the regulations.
10. Do you find much difficulty in getting the surveyors to act under the new regulations? No; they have, I think, generally waited in hope of better things or of some better arrangement.
11. They have not been particularly pleased with the change? No.
12. On what ground? That the fees are not sufficient.
13. Can you specify upon what grounds the surveyors have taken objection? That the fees are felt to be too low in view of the improved character of the work required, and there is no provision made for mileage as Mr. Black advocates—that is to say, paying the surveyors for travelling to the work. There has been a certain amount of dissatisfaction expressed to me from time to time; but as far as I know, only one surveyor has protested officially.
14. Have you found very much improvement in the class of work since the new regulations were issued? Yes.
15. Give us a comparison between the present and the old work? Perhaps I can best answer that question by referring you to the statement of the surveyor who made the protest. He states in a letter: "Hitherto the surveys made in this district have been effected in the roughest possible manner, and with but little regard to strict accuracy. Old surveys have been assumed to be correct, and worked in with new, without question; the most glaring discrepancies passing through 'the Office' unnoticed, so that in very many cases not more than one half the lot under survey has been actually measured. The boundary lines, though generally well marked, have not been sufficiently clear for accurate chainage, and the chaining itself has been hurriedly performed. Moreover, the actual boundaries of lots fronting the roads or reserves have neither been marked on the ground nor calculated on the plans. Therefore, setting aside the question of use of compass and theodolite, the work required under the new regulations is nearly double that previously demanded of us."
16. Does that state of things apply to one district only, as far as you know? I think it is put rather strongly, but it is the gentleman's own words. I have come across cases where there were similar discrepancies or falsifications in different parts of the Colony. The subject is treated in my last annual report.
17. To what district does the letter particularly refer? Mr. Innes's.
18. Whose petition led to this inquiry? Yes.
19. *By Mr. Mackenzie*.—Was the information you read given voluntarily by Mr. Innes? Yes. The information was submitted to me, after having been placed before the Department by Mr. Innes.
20. *By the Chairman*.—The letter was written, I presume, by Mr. Innes, with a view to secure larger fees than those given under the present system? I presume so.
21. Do you understand that it is a correct description of the ordinary work done for many years in that district? I should say so.
22. Does it refer to other surveyors? I do not know.
23. You know Mr. Innes has been in that district many years? Yes.

Surveys.

24. From your knowledge of the older surveys of the colony prior to your appointment, do you think that there has been to any large extent such work done as has been described by Mr. Innes in that district? I should not think so, to any large extent. You will find it at different places; I have come across it at a few places.

25. Do you find it in heavily timbered districts generally? Yes; but sometimes in the open as well.

26. *By Mr. M'Kenzie.*—Were there discrepancies on recent or old surveys? There were some quite recent.

27. *By the Chairman.*—Do you consider that under the old, and somewhat careless system, surveyors were paid in excess of what they ought to have been? In some cases. There are two phases of surveys. I have found a lot of old work extremely good, and quite equal to anything done now, and some of it very bad.

28. Would that refer to timber districts as well as to more open country? Generally to open country; but I have found both good and bad in open country.

29. Do you ever find good surveys in the heavily timbered country under the old system? No, not in old surveys, but I have found some very good new ones.

30. Are you generally satisfied with the improvements that have been made under the new regulations? In some cases I am extremely pleased, and in all cases I find the marking and chainage generally good.

31. Would that improvement apply to the district of Mr. Innes as well as others? He informed me that he surveys with a compass, which is a direct breach of the new regulations.

32. As a matter of fact, are they better in character then prior to the new regulations being enforced? His marking only is better than it used to be; they all are.

33. Have you examined any of the surveys in the Franklin district? Not very many. I have examined some of Mr. Coombes's work and of Mr. Innis's: I suppose half a dozen or a dozen in each case, taken at haphazard.

34. Have you examined Innes's work prior to the new regulations? No.

35. Then you have had no means of comparing his work as now performed with that before? No, I can only go by the voluntary statement read.

36. Do you think the surveyors generally are likely to gradually improve in their work under the present scale of fees, or will they be more likely to continue doing as they are now doing? I do not expect any improvement in the class of work.

37. Do you take any step to insist that those whose work is not satisfactory to you shall do it better? That is not my province. I simply report, and it rests with others.

38. Do you know whether the Department insists on improved work to be done where you report it inferior? I do not know.

39. Do you approve of Mr. Black's recommendations in regard to fees? I do not approve of fees at all; but I prefer Mr. Black's scale of payment to that now in use by the Department. Personally, I approve of payment by salary.

40. Do you regard the present system of payment by fees as being somewhat unfair, because of its paying the same rate for all class of work? Yes.

41. I think you have said that Mr. Innes is the only one who has protested formally against the present system? Yes, as far as I know.

42. Have you heard many expressions of dissatisfaction with the scale of fees since the new regulations came into force? Two or three cases: of course there are only 14 district surveyors.

43. How many surveyors are there whose work lies chiefly in heavily timbered country? I cannot say—the work varies so much. Everybody has some very thick country. Some are better off than others, perhaps; but, as a matter of fact, there is little open country.

44. Would you regard the Huon district as amongst the most difficult and rough for surveyors? I have seen equally bad places.

45. Would you think it desirable, if the system of payment of surveyors by fees is continued, to perpetuate the present uniform rate of payment, or regulate the payment according to the class of country? The latter might be done with advantage.

46. You are aware that, prior to Mr. Black's recommendations, there was a different scale of payment according to the class of country? I was not aware of it.

47. It follows, then, that you were not consulted as to any alteration in the scale of fees? No.

48. Would you think it desirable to apportion the scale of fees to the quality of the work done? Yes.

49. That would necessitate an inspection before payment always? Yes; and, owing to that, I think it would be impracticable, because the cost would be increased to so great an extent.

50. From your knowledge of the character of the surveys generally, would you now be prepared to recommend any alteration in the system of payment? Yes. I think higher fees should be given, in dense forests, but for really good work only.

51. Would you be prepared to go the length of Mr. Black's recommendations as to the scale of payment? Yes.

52. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—As a matter of fact, that system has not been adopted? No.

53. *By the Chairman.*—You were appointed generally with the object of carrying out Mr. Black's recommendations? Yes.

54. And yet you have not adopted his scale of fees? I must point out that that does not rest with me.

55. Do you know why the scale of fees recommended by Mr. Black has not been adopted? I cannot say.

56. Do you think the fees could be so regulated that higher payment could be made in dense forests, and lower payments in more open country, so that the total cost would be much about the same as now? I do not see how it is to be done; there is very little open country except on the West Coast.

57. Is there any country for which you would recommend a lower rate of payment than that which is now the standard rate?—take, for example, some of the open country on the West Coast such as the mineral leases? Speaking generally, I would not recommend a lower rate; the country is so diversified.

58. What would you consider a fair remuneration to survey a block of 320 acres in the worst country you know we have? I have not gone into it.

59. Mr. Black recommends £20: is that fair remuneration? It is not excessive.

60. Do you think £13 15s., given under the present scale, is enough? I do not think so.

61. In the Gippsland district in Victoria, I believe they pay £24 for that area; would that be excessive for 320 acres of the most densely wooded country, if the work was carried out to your satisfaction? No, I do not think so, considering lost time owing to wet weather, especially if it was a detached survey.

62. Have you any knowledge of the cost of the surveys for one year? I think about £7000 a year, but I do not know for certain. That could, however, be ascertained.

63. Do you think that the amount now paid for surveys throughout the Colony could be divided fairly amongst the surveyors employed to give them each a fair salary? We should have to allow some private work besides.

64. How would you apportion their time? The matter is fraught with a considerable amount of difficulty.

65. Is the whole of the time of the surveyors at the disposal of the Government in New Zealand, or are they allowed private work? I do not know. I know South Australia.

66. How are the surveyors paid there? By salaries.

67. Is the whole of their time occupied? All their time is at the disposal of the Government; they are not allowed any private work of any kind whatever.

68. Are they generally found fully occupied? Yes.

69. Is there any contract survey done there for the Government? No.

70. *By Mr. Dooley.*—I think you stated that you examined surveys in different parts of the Colony? Yes.

71. Were they all recent? They were supposed to have been done since the issue of the regulations, but I have been on older surveys.

72. How did you find those surveys? Some of the old work was excellent, I think, belonging to the salaried staff.

73. Were these effected under certain regulations? I do not know.

74. If they were so well done more time may have been spent on them than that prescribed: would not that follow? I do not think so.

75. Are you acquainted with the regulations immediately before those new ones? I did not know that there were any; I have not seen them.

76. How could you possibly examine surveys that were made under regulations you did not know of, and report upon them? I could tell whether they were faulty or not.

77. If you got on one of those old surveys how could you tell if you did not know under what conditions the contracting surveyor did the work? I could not tell whether the marking was sufficient or insufficient, not knowing the specifications.

78. Have you done any of the examinations personally yourself? Yes.

79. About what area? They would run from 50 to 100 acres.

80. Do you keep a field journal? Yes.

81. Can you furnish us with the time and cost of any one particular lot from your journal, apportioning your own salary, that of your men, and the time? Yes, and I can also tell you what the results were.

82. Then you will furnish an example or two for the Committee showing those particulars? Yes.

83. Have you observed any peculiarity in the marking you disapproved of? Only in one case. Generally it is uniform and good. I refer to work under the new regulations.

84. Have you examined any marking under the former system? I have seen it. There was a want of uniformity amongst the surveyors. Some mark excellently well, and others did not mark well.

85. They were each furnished with the same system? Well, they did not comply.

86. You do not know, then, whether the present regulations coincide with the former in reference to the marking and clearing of the lines? I do not think the regulations are quite the same.

87. Supposing you went out to examine the work of a surveyor of 20 years' standing, how could you report on his work if you did not know the regulations under which he was engaged? I take it that these old regulations are past and done with.

88. You don't examine any of that work? No.

89. When were Mr. Innes's surveys effected that are referred to? Since the regulations.
90. Have you known the use of the circumferenter being allowed? I believe Mr. Innes has been told that he might go on as before for the present.
91. Is that known to the Department? Yes. He made a protest, and all the work I examined was done by that, except a little theodolite work.

MR. GEORGE INNES, *examined.*

92. *By the Chairman.*—You are a District Surveyor? Yes, District Surveyor for the South Huon District.
93. How long have you occupied the position of district surveyor there? About 25 years.
94. *By Mr. Sutton.*—Have you been in that district continuously for that time? Yes.
95. *By the Chairman.*—That is, you have had charge of the district? Yes, but I notice by a copy of letter (produced) applying in 1882 for the office of Inspector of Surveys, that I was working at the Huon in 1855, more than 30 years ago, and before District Surveyors were appointed.
96. You were dissatisfied with the emoluments you received during your term of service there, and desired an improved position? During your term of service in the district have you ever made representations until recently as to your dissatisfaction with the emoluments you have received? Yes, I have frequently done so.
97. What response did your applications receive? In most cases they have been recognised, and I have been promised a better district as soon as opportunity occurred.
98. You have had occasional employment out of the district? Yes.
99. Was that more profitable to you? Certainly; much more profitable.
100. How was it that work outside the district was so much more profitable than work in it? Because it was of a more open character—the country was not so rough.
101. Was it contract work or day work you were employed upon out of the district? Chiefly contract work; but I have been employed recently at day work on the railway surveys. The most remunerative work I have had has been contract work out of my district.
102. Did you ever seek to have special recognition of your claims while in your own district as to increased pay there, or is your dissatisfaction directed chiefly to the work as a whole, and your wish to be removed to another district? No,—until the issue of these regulations.
103. Since the issue of the new regulations, two or three years ago, what course have you taken with regard to them? When the new regulations were first issued I distinctly declined to be bound by them.
104. On what grounds? Upon the ground that it was perfectly impossible to carry out the work in the manner in which it was supposed to be carried out by those regulations for the money the Government then gave.
105. When you received your appointment were there any conditions as to the character of the work and the amount of the pay? There was a scale of fees.
106. Any condition as to the quality of the work? The work was under the ordinary instructions, except that in my case a special exemption was made. Mr. Dooley will perhaps remember that Mr. Calder issued a circular that all work was to be done by theodolite. When I received that circular I saw the late Mr. Calder, and asked if it was intended to apply it to my district, because if it was so intended I would have to give up the district. He replied that he did not intend to apply it to me, and from that day I was never in any degree bound by it. I have no writing to that effect, but I have the fact that my surveys have always been effected by the compass, and bear the fact upon the face of them.
107. Do you consider that to ask you to comply with the new regulations without having first consulted you as to your willingness to do so was unsatisfactory? I complained of it as unjust, and perhaps used terms that were strong, but I afterwards explained to the Minister of Lands that I did not intend to imply that the Minister was unjust, but that the system would act with injustice.
108. You made representations, I think, to the Department at that time with reference to the work under the new regulations—as to the injustice of it, and your desire that some examination of the character of the work should be made, and the fees arranged accordingly? I did. I asked that the Inspector might be sent to survey certain lots then in hand, in order to prove that it was perfectly impossible to carry out the surveys to the satisfaction of the Government, and in the manner in which the Inspector required it, for anything like the money they were asking that it should be done for. I think my letter to the Government asked that test surveys should be made by the Inspector, and the Inspector took some exception to that. I did not mean that the Inspector himself should make the surveys, but that they should be made by another surveyor under his personal superintendence.
109. Did you point out that under the new regulations there was something inequitable in the decision that all surveys were to be paid for alike, whereas there was formerly a difference made between rough and open country? Yes. It was that that I took particular exception to, because up to that period there had always been some difference between difficult country and open country of about 25 per cent., which the new regulations did away with. The new regulations raised the fees in the open country, where there was less difficulty with the work, and in the rough country increased the amount of work for the same money.
110. It required an increased amount of work for the open country? No. There is nothing in these

regulations to cause any extra amount of work in the open country by the manner in which the work has to be done. The only difference was that hitherto the former regulations had not been strictly enforced. I wish to qualify this answer by stating that some little extra work is required by the new regulations in open country—for instance, the marking of frontage boundaries, &c., but not nearly so much as in rough country.

111. Then, speaking generally, all surveyors in open country are better off under the new regulations? Decidedly so.

112. And all those in the rough country are required to do better work for the same pay as before? Yes.

113. I think you have told us that you requested that the value of the class of work required to be done in difficult country under the new regulations should be ascertained by practical test? Yes.

114. And was that ever made? It has never been done.

115. Not in your district? No.

116. Do you think it has been done in other districts of a similar character? I do not know any other district of a similar character. I have been at work in all parts of Tasmania, and have certainly never come across any country where the work was anything like it is at the Huon.

117. Has the Inspector visited the Huon and examined your work since his appointment? Yes, once.

118. Was it work done years ago, or work done recently, or both, that he inspected? Work done recently, so far as I am aware of. I had no official information. The Inspector told me that he had instructions to examine certain lots which were recently done. They were not rough lots, but were exceptional lots for that country. One was on the hillside opposite the *Picnic Hotel*—comparatively open country, timbered, but not scrubby. The other was at Gardner's Bay, and was equally exceptional as regards the Huon—quite open and comparatively level. I suggested to Mr. Hardy that he should also visit Surges Bay and see some lots I had just done; these were rough lots, and he went over the lines of two of them.

119. Has the Inspector seen some of the roughest country you have had to survey in your district? Hardly, since he has never visited Port Esperance, Southport, or Recherche Bay.

120. Did he see a block taken by William Cearn's? Yes; at Surges Bay.

121. Was that an average specimen of rough country there? Yes, quite.

122. What was the size of the block? One hundred acres.

123. Did he express any opinion as to what would be a fair payment for the survey of that? He did not say anything to me; I only know from a letter I have from Mr. Sprent that the inspector said such a survey could be accurately done for £14.

124. Accurately—that is, according to existing regulations? Mr. Sprent's letter is a little indefinite, I conclude, however, that the Inspector had merely taken into account the time it would take a surveyor and party to run the lines, without allowance for time lost travelling or from bad weather. The regulations would only allow £8 15s. for this survey, the value of which Mr. Hardy estimates at £14.

125. Then pending this visit of Mr. Hardy, I understand you were allowed to work under the old regulations, generally speaking? Yes.

126. I should say you were not compelled to work under the new regulations? When I made the representation to the Minister with regard to the impossibility of carrying out these regulations, Mr. Sprent replied that the Minister would take my letter into consideration, and that I might go on making surveys as before, while an early opportunity would be taken of examining what special difficulties existed in my district.

127. Was that visit of Mr. Hardy to make this investigation? I do not know, he did not tell me that it was. No, if I understood him rightly he was only inspecting my work. I do not think an investigation has ever been made.

128. Has any exception been taken to the character of your work since the visit of Mr. Hardy? Certainly not, except this letter of Mr. Sprent stating that the inspector reported that Mr. Innes had not always been particular in marking with triangles. The inspector, in speaking to me about it, expressed himself thoroughly satisfied with the work. He told me of one case where a line was rather imperfectly marked. I have not seen any copy of Mr. Hardy's report on my work, which it is always usual to do if there is any fault found.

129. Then, with the exception you have named, you are not aware of any complaints as to the character of your work since the new regulations came into operation? No.

130. How long is it since Mr. Hardy visited you? He was down a little before this time last year.

131. Then it was long before that you were informed an early opportunity would be taken to investigate the difficulties attending the work of surveying in the Huon? Yes, at the time of issuing the regulations, in 1884.

132. Then, from September, 1884, till about the same time in 1885, no step was taken? No, no examination was made into my work whatever during that time.

133. And since that examination has been made you have just been allowed to go on in the same way? Yes.

134. Have you been doing a better class of work since the new regulations came into force, or does the work correspond to the work done before? I have been doing a better class of work. I felt bound to do so.

135. *By Mr. Sutton.*—That better class of work entails more time, and reduces your emolument? Certainly, it does. Until these regulations came out we used the compass in all surveys. In many cases

where, for economy, I used the compass I now have to use the theodolite ; but where I find it impossible to make a theodolite survey at any ordinary cost I use the compass. Other surveys are made with the theodolite just the same as in other districts. The regulations are complied with to this extent.

136. Your work includes that of your assistants ? Yes.

137. Is the class of their work improved since the regulations came into force, as well as your own ? Yes.

138. Do they use the theodolite ? Yes, in cases where they can. I do not think Mr. Stansfield does, as he is working in rougher country, but Mr. E. G. Innes does. I do not think they have done what I have done, but I have not been able to say anything about it in checking their work, for the simple reason that they could not make anything out of it.

139. In what respect is your work better done now than it was formerly ? There are various ways in which it is better. There is one point in particular which I am obliged to carry out under the new regulations, and which involves an extra amount of work—that is, with regard to marking the frontage lines. Under the old regulations we took the coast-line, but under the new regulations we have to survey the actual boundaries, marking them on the ground. The consequence of this in rough country is that it entails double work. Mr. E. G. Innes completed some surveys at Recherche before the new regulations came out, but because the plans did not go in then he was obliged to go back and run the lines to mark the actual boundary, and it took him one and a half days extra simply to put in these lines for 100 acres.

140. That would not have been done under the old system ? No.

141. Did you not think yourself exempted from that work ? No ; I only think I am exempted from that part of the regulations which prohibits the use of the compass. All other regulations I am expected to carry out.

142. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Do you recognise any utility in marking that inner boundary line ? Yes ; I consider it desirable to do so, though it involves extra expense. There are many cases where high-water mark is very indefinite. As an instance, I may refer to the township of Franklin, where the river boundary has considerably altered since original survey.

143. *By Mr. Bird.*—Do you think the Department knows that yourself and assistants, speaking generally, use the compass and not the theodolite ? Yes, they could not help knowing it. It is even stated in the report of the Inspector that such is the case.

144. You think the Department understands that if the payment for surveys was increased to a fair amount, you would have no objection to carry out the work according to the new regulations ? They do so understand, as I have stated in correspondence that I prefer doing the work under the new regulations, because I prefer scientific work to work that is rough and unscientific in character.

145. What do you consider a fair payment for a block of 320 acres in the Huon district ? I was asked to suggest a scale of fees for surveys (embracing three classes of country) which, in my opinion, would suffice to provide for compliance in all cases with the present regulations—that is, with the complete abandonment of the use of the compass as a surveying instrument. I feel very considerable difficulty in replying to the question, my experience being that the country south of Hobart is in its general character entirely exceptional as regards difficulty of survey, and must be treated as “exceptional” to do justice to the surveyors employed ; and I would name a precedent for such exceptional treatment in the scale now in force (page 4 of “Regulations,” under heading of Goldfields Act), by which lots in the West and North-West districts are to be paid for (whether dense or open) at rates which on an average will be 50 per cent. above those for other parts of the colony. Excepting the Huon and West Coast, I could not name a fairer scale than that indicated by Mr. Black at page 16 of his Report, but as in most districts there is a good deal of work which would only be paid for at the lowest rates, I am not sure but that the present scale (by averaging) amounts to much the same thing. I do not think I stated in previous evidence the fact that, although there was no “written law” on the subject, it was understood that all surveys in the Huon district would be charged as “heavily-timbered” under the old scale, the fees for such being in all cases demanded of selectors. The question was settled by Mr. Calder, when Surveyor-General, by his deciding in a case that occurred that there is no country at the Huon that could be classed as “ordinary Crown land.” The Inspector (Mr. Hardy) estimated the cost of survey of one particular lot of 100 acres (of about a fair average as regards roughness) at £14. This, as I understood, was without allowance for loss of time, travelling, or from bad weather, which (again averaging) would increase it about 25 per cent., making it £17 10s., as against £12 by Mr. Black’s scale, clearly showing that the latter is, so far as regards lots of over 50 acres, *too low*. I would, however, undertake to carry on the district work strictly in accordance with regulations, and to properly supervise the work of my assistants, on Mr. Black’s scale, provided it is recognised, as before, that there is, as regards payment for surveys, no “open or ordinary land” in the district, treating it to this extent as “exceptional ;” roads to be paid for as at present, and extraordinary difficulties in the re-establishment of old boundaries to be charged as special and by time, as in such cases extreme caution is needful to prevent encroachments and complications. I have for some years past declined to effect private re-surveys excepting upon the understanding that I should be paid for any tests which I might consider it necessary to apply to prevent encroachments, and I think it essential that the same principle should be recognised by the Government, as it has been practically by Mr. Sprent since his appointment as Deputy Surveyor-General. I should be satisfied with an increase of survey fees to extent of 25 per cent. for the work to be done in the same manner as at present, but should much prefer the better class of work. I was asked if I should be satisfied with increased pay for the future, or should I expect to receive compensation for the time during which as shown I have not earned a living ? In further reply to this question, I will say that under ordinary circumstances I should be content that my claim to increased pay in the future should be recognised ; but, as a matter of fact, I am in the position of being unable to meet outstanding claims, and more than this, owing to the “hand-to-mouth” manner in which I have been working for the past two years, my field equipment has not been attended to, and I require an outlay for instruments, tents, &c., and on boat, for

which I have no available means; and I would respectfully ask the Committee, in deciding upon any recommendations they may make with reference to my petition, to take into consideration the fact that I am comparatively an old man, and have been the half of a lifetime in the service of the Government.

146. Have you ever given in a statement to the Department as to the very rough manner in which work has been done in the Huon district? Yes, at different times. I have sent a memorial to the Governor in Council, and I have sent a report to the Government, which would best answer the question with regard to the cost of these surveys.

147. Did you ever point out that the lines were insufficiently cleared and could not be found? In the case of my own old work the lines were not as well cleared or marked or as accurately chained as it should be—could not afford the necessary time—but it was done as well as possible for the money paid for it. With regard to work done by others before my time, for the most part it is grossly inaccurate, hard to find, and a great deal of it done only on paper, no boundaries being marked on the ground.

148. *By Mr. Sutton.*—Have the Government ever recognised the principle of getting the work done in this slipshod manner, and paying for it in this paltry way? They seem to have recognised it in former years, economy rather than accuracy having been the order of the day.

149. *By the Chairman.*—Do you think discrepancies were recognised in the office here? No, there was no field inspection, and no inspection in the office, or not what could be termed inspection. I find in some cases errors occurred. The other day I got a tracing sent to me describing some work done by Mr. Stansfield some few years ago in which there was a discrepancy between one of the lines and a former survey, which had occurred in consequence of a reserved road not having been taken into account. I have noticed other cases of serious discrepancies, all of which, of course, if there had been a proper system of check in the office, ought to have been referred to me at the time.

150. Do you think there is any better check now than before Mr. Hardy came? Yes, very much indeed. There is nothing at all to complain of now. I have nothing to complain of in this respect. If the slightest discrepancy arises now they write to me, and if the error is large I have to make a re-survey of the lot at my own cost. One or two such cases have occurred.

151. Has there been any inspection of your assistants' work since Mr. Hardy's appointment? No lot surveyed by my assistants has been even seen by Mr. Hardy, to the best of my belief.

152. Speaking generally, would you have approved of Mr. Black's suggestions as to the fees for surveys? Speaking generally, I think I would: perhaps with this reservation, that I think the work in the Huon district is such that to carry it out in all cases exactly in accordance with these regulations, Mr. Black's fees are not high enough. If all the work were paid in accordance with the scale indicated by Mr. Black for the roughest country, then I believe it could be done.

153. Did he visit the Huon district? No.

154. Did he have any information before him as to the character of the country there? I think not; I do not know who could have given it to him.

155. If not by you, by Mr. Coombs? I do not know; it might have been so.

156. Do you know from personal experience anything of the rough country in Victoria—Gippsland for instance? No; I have never been in rough country in Victoria.

157. Have you heard of its character—whether there is anything corresponding to the Huon district? All that I have heard is, that there is nothing as bad as the Huon. I had an assistant last year who told me when first he came to me that he had been used to rough country in Gippsland, but when he got to the Huon he acknowledged that there was nothing like that in Victoria.

158. Do you know what fees are allowed in Victoria for surveys in the Gippsland district? Only from what I gather from the papers. I notice from the *Australasian*, that under the new land regulations the survey fee for 320 acres, in the roughest parts of Victoria, is £25. Here it is £13 15s. This is the maximum. Tenders are called for the surveys.

159. If the scale of fees was altered now so that the work in the rough country was paid for at the highest rate according to Mr. Black's suggestion, would you feel satisfied to go on from the present with the increase, or would you consider from your peculiar circumstances that you were entitled to some compensation for the work done since you protested against the system? I certainly think I am entitled to some compensation, although, at the same time, I would go on—would have to go on—without. But I think I am entitled to some compensation, as I have shown in my petition. Since these regulations I have not made my family expenses. I had a somewhat similar case when the late Mr. Calder was Surveyor-General, with respect to some tramways. Mr. Calder came down to see me and told me I would be required to go down to Port Esperance to lay out a line of tramway for the Government, at £10 per mile. I told him it could not be done for the money; but he said I would have to go. I then said I would go, but it would be under protest, and if I found it could be done for £10 a mile I would do it for that. I found it could not be done, and claimed payment at a rate per day; and instead of £10 it came to very nearly £20 per mile, which rate was paid both to myself and Mr. Hall.

160. That was, after fixing the fees they found they were at too low a rate? Yes. I could not demand anything, as I went on doing the work, but Mr. Calder, knowing the fees were insufficient, recommended the extra payment.

161. *By Mr. Sutton.*—Has the Department acknowledged your protest as to doing the work pending a consideration? No, I do not know that they have, but I pointed out, after seven months' working of the new regulations, that I was not earning a living.

162. You have simply drawn their attention to the amount fixed for surveying in that particular portion of the country as not being sufficient to do the work in the way it is desired: what response or reply have you had to that? No reply, except an office letter that an early opportunity would be taken to investigate my complaint. This was at the very first, in 1884; I have had no reply to the representations I have since made.

163. *By the Chairman.*—Do you know anything of the way surveys are effected in the Huon district, outside of your own portion, by other surveyors? I only know that Mr. Coombs told me himself that he does not carry out the regulations any more than I do. He told me he does the same as I do—carries out the present regulations as far as they can be reasonably carried out, only he uses a compass attached to his theodolite and I use a circumferentor.

164. Do you know if Mr. Coombs was visited by the Inspector? Yes; the Inspector told me so.

165. From your knowledge of the Colony, what other district do you think would correspond most closely to the Huon district as to the rough character of the country? I don't think there is anything at all approaching to it. There may be parts of other districts—for instance, parts of the North-West Coast may be called as bad as the roughest parts of the Huon district—but they would be entirely exceptional. I am speaking from actual experience, because I have been at work on the North-West Coast myself, and during the time I was there I did work to the amount of £1000 total value in 12 months. Some of the work was open and some of it rough, but there was certainly nothing I came across anything like the average of the Huon district. This was nearly 30 years ago.

166. *By Mr. Dooley.*—You have made some surveys for tram roads and main roads: did these give entire satisfaction? Yes.

167. Did you furnish sections and plans? The work for the tramway was done exactly in the same way as for a railway survey. The ground was pegged out every chain, the levels taken, and even estimates for the earthworks given.

168. What instruments did you use in this case? The theodolite.

169. I see by the illustration that roads passing through an allotment are marked through the centre? It is shown in the example, but I do not think it is insisted upon.

170. *By the Chairman.*—Do you mean to inform the Committee that what is required there in the survey of a road as part of the regulations is not insisted upon? I cannot say it is part of the regulations. It is on the diagram or specimen plan; but the regulations themselves do not say that it is required. All roads on which allotments front require to be marked, and that is done.

171. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Do you think it would not be better to mark the actual boundaries, and not mark the centre of the road on which an allotment fronts?—in most cases the road is intended to be opened at some time, and the centre marks will then be done away with. In view of that, would it not be better to mark the actual boundaries? I only know that to so mark the roads would entail a large amount of work. At present we mark the angles on the boundary lines by well-secured corner pins.

172. That was not the case under the old instructions that preceded these? No. Under the former instructions we did not leave any marks on the side-bounds of roads, except at the crossing of boundary-lines, where we put in corner-pegs. That was a loose system of doing the work.

173. Suppose an allotment fronted on a road, would you not in that case mark the roadside on the boundary of the allotment instead of the centre? It would all depend upon circumstances. There is no rule obliging you to do it. It would not be done in general, excepting, as before stated, at the angular points.

174. Have you got the regulations issued when the late Mr. Butler was Minister? No, I have different circulars, but they were never compiled. There was no rule, and there was no complaint when you marked the survey on the boundary lines, and put in corner-pegs, leaving nothing at all along the line of road.

175. But suppose a road was open, would not marks be put in at once? Yes, in some cases; but the corner pegs only were adopted in most cases.

176. Do you think that the best way? I think it would be best to mark the actual boundary, although it would entail extra work.

177. *By Mr. Sutton.*—And that extra work would tell against the surveyor, inasmuch as he gets so much per lot? Yes.

178. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Is there anything in these new regulations as to the system of marking? Yes, marks are to be by triangles.

179. That was not the case in the regulations preceding these—they only required side-marking of trees? Yes, only blazing.

180. Has the marking by blaze only, led to any difficulty in subsequently discovering the boundaries? Not if well done. I have found marks of that kind made by the late Mr. Calder 50 years ago.

181. In asking that the Inspector might look at some of the work you were doing, your object was that he might ascertain the time it took, and thereby calculate the cost of effecting these surveys? Yes. I did not mean that the Inspector should do the work. I may have been wrong to suggest that, and he, very naturally, took it as *infra dig.*; but I meant to suggest that some one should make a test under his supervision.

182. *By the Chairman.*—Would you approve of a system of paying surveyors by salary rather than by schedule prices? I certainly think it would be fairer.

183. Do you think it would be practicable? Yes; it is done in other places. It would be fairer than the present system, unless the present system could be altered to make it more equitable. As Mr. Black says, the present system is so inequitable that one surveyor is paid a great deal more than others for doing similar work.

184. *By Mr. Dooley.*—It appears to me that some surveyors have abundance of work, while others have not enough? Yes, that is the case. At the same time there would not have been any complaint if the Government gave a man all the work in his district, and paid him fairly for it. It is not as if I had not sufficient work. I have had work enough, of the roughest character, to employ all my time, and have made nothing at all out of it. That is what I complain of.

185. *By the Chairman.*—Have you had sufficient work outside your district at an improved pay—such as you have referred to—which would enable you to make a fair average of payment? No, I have not. During the whole 25 or 30 years there have been only two or three occasions on which I have made anything at all extra. On the North-West Coast I had work that, done by myself alone (without any professional assistant), came to £1000 for 12 months under the former scale of fees. I was at work at Sorell and East Coast with one assistant, and the average amount of work we did came to £140 or £150 per month. Of course the expenditure for the parties came out of it. At Flat Top, five or six years ago, I did some work amounting to £200 in 2½ months without any assistant. This is just merely as against what I have been able to earn in my own district. About two years ago I was sent to the West Coast, and did work amounting to £200 for six weeks. I had a party, and, of course, there were very heavy expenses attached to it. My petition shows that in 1885, in my own district, the total amount of work I did amounted to about £300 for myself, and my assistant did about the same. We were both at work the whole year.

186. *By Mr. Dooley.*—What percentage do you allow your assistants? Seventy-five per cent.

187. Do you know if that is a general rate? Yes, I have always understood that is the general rate.

188. And you have to plot and check their work before sending it away? It always passes through my hands and I check it, but I do not always plot it. I am supposed to check it in the field as well, but I cannot do it—I cannot afford to do it.

189. You countersign the diagram, and if there is anything wrong you are responsible? Yes. I have pointed it out to the Minister of Lands and positively refused to do it any more. I have to be responsible for it and cannot afford to check it. I have to take the work as it is done, and I know my assistants do not earn any more than their chainmen.

190. *By the Chairman.*—Do you get much private work in the district? Very little.

191. Does it make any appreciable difference in your earnings? No, I took only £300 for the year; and being employed all the year, my party expenses were £200 out of it.

192. Do you mean you were at work in the field, bad weather excepted, all the year through? Yes, with one exception—about Christmas time I am a month at home. During the year 1885, with that exception, I was at work, or prepared to go as soon as the weather would allow.

193. And you are obliged to get extra labour? Yes, I am obliged to take extra assistance on account of the extra marking. If the Government would put me on the same footing with regard to other surveyors, as before issue of new regulations, and give me 25 per cent. advance, I should be satisfied to go on doing the work—that is, to carry out the regulations as far as it could reasonably be done; not to carry out the regulations in their entirety with regard to theodolite work.

194. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Is there any rule making it imperative upon a surveyor to put stakes in after the theodolite has been used? No, I do not think so; it merely stipulates that the theodolite should be used.

195. *By the Chairman.*—What objection have you to using the theodolite? It involves so much more work. In the Huon district there are many objections: it is so rough, and the lines are so imperfectly cleared that it is positively unsafe to carry the instrument.

196. *By Mr. Dooley.*—With the circumferentor you sight a tree 10 chains away and walk straight to it? Yes, stake a line to it. With the theodolite, instead of doing that, you have a complicated system of taking angles around it. There is this to be said: an error made by the theodolite continues right throughout the survey, whereas by the compass it is limited; much more care is therefore needed.

197. *By the Chairman.*—In your petition I notice you have expressed the opinion “That the whole of the surveys throughout the island can be carried out in a properly scientific and accurate manner at a cost to the country not exceeding that at present incurred, by the adoption of a system by which each surveyor shall receive adequate pay, and no more, for the time he is employed; abolishing the anomaly which at present exists of officers of similar grade, and equal in every other respect, working under such different circumstances as to give them incomes ranging from starvation point to £800 or £900 a year.” By what system do you think that could be done? By the salary system. I believe under the salary system surveys would not cost more than now if surveyors did honest work and carried out their work fairly.

198. Do you think that by a readjustment of the fees—that is, by reducing the fees in open country and increasing those for rough country—anything could be accomplished? I should not like to make any suggestion with regard to reducing other fees. I do not care if other surveyors make £1000 a year. I want to make a living myself, and if I can get that I do not care how much other surveyors get.

199. Do you think the payment for open country now is excessive? I think there are cases where it becomes excessive where there are a great number of small lots together. I can show how, with a number of lots, Mr. Sprent himself did very well. I am not taking this case because Mr. Sprent is Deputy Surveyor-General, because I believe Mr. Sprent really deserved what he got; but it is an example of how the fees act for a large number of lots being surveyed together in a comparatively open country, and the large sum of money that can be got out of it. Another case was brought before the House, where Mr. Walpole, in surveying township allotments, made £1500 in 6 or 7 months. I do not believe that if salaried surveyors were employed, and all paid fair salaries, the work would cost more than it does at present. At the same time I would not recommend any reduction.

200. *By Mr. Dooley.*—In the event of salaries being paid to district surveyors, and the probability of their not being always employed in effecting surveys, do you think other work, such as laying out roads, extending roads, or other work to fill up their time could be found, cutting tracks and exploring new country, for instance? Yes, and in checking old surveys as well. I should like to show the Committee some facts of the work in the Huon district. [The witness produced a plan of his district, and stated that he was obliged to keep a whaleboat, prepared for sea, to go to Recherche Bay and other parts. Mr. E. G. Innes was at Recherche a little time ago and found it impossible to make a survey owing to the

difficulty of finding the old lines. There are now two lots to survey there, the fees for which together amount to £6 5s., and there will probably be much difficulty in finding the old line to join on to.

201. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Would the public interests be served by making out plans of a number of lots? I would not recommend it in all cases. Some of it has been done, and I would not recommend it being done again. There is some work marked out, and it would be better if it had not been done at all. At Hythe, some years ago, I had to trace the township boundary for two miles (taking me three days) before I could get a starting point for a survey of 25 acres, for which I got paid £3 15s.

202. All this difficulty would be overcome by payment by salary? Yes, or by payment for actual time employed. Difficulties arise through having to run down lines to join, and discrepancies occur through running down imaginary lines without taking steps to check it; hence a good deal of the work is felt to be unsatisfactory. I produce the plan of the township of Liverpool, where there is shown a great discrepancy between the old lines and the position they should really occupy. The difference exceeds 1 acre in lots of 10 acres. In some cases there is a difference of from two to three chains between the lines as laid out and their exact position. A portion of this land has been cut up and sold, and people are actually occupying lots they did not purchase, by mistake. I am now referring to the office to know what is to be done. The only way it can be rectified is to recall the grants and make fresh grants. The Government is to blame for not having paid sufficiently well to institute proper test surveys.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1886.

MR. W. M. HARDY, *recalled and examined.*

203. *By the Chairman.*—You have had considerable experience in your profession? Yes.

[Mr. Hardy here handed in testimonials from Mr. J. W. Jones, Deputy Surveyor-General of South Australia, dated February, 1883; and a letter from Mr. J. W. Goyder, Surveyor-General of South Australia, acknowledging the services rendered by Mr. Hardy in carrying out a trigonometrical survey of that colony, and the 16 years he was in that Department.]

204. To what extent have inspections of field-work been made by you, such as that referred to by you in the report you have tabled? I have made ordinary inspections, such as the Deputy Surveyor-General or Chief Surveyor in South Australia does in examining work. I also chained places here and there on the closing line, having reference chiefly to the marking and chaining, but I took an angle now and then.

205. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—Have you found any discrepancies in the bearings? The bearings are magnetic, so that there is always a discrepancy. I have found discrepancies.

206. *By the Chairman.*—Have you been in the district of each surveyor for the purpose of field surveying? Yes, with the exception of the districts of Messrs. Jones, Windsor, and Sorell.

207. Do you consider it sufficient to inspect occasionally a survey which has been effected by any particular surveyor, or is it desirable that all the work should be inspected? It is only necessary to inspect work here and there at haphazard. The expense of examining all the work would be too great.

208. That is the custom elsewhere, is it not? Yes, here and there where the surveyors least expect it.

209. Have you any system of check by which you can discover discrepancies in the office? Yes, the work, if done according to the new regulations, affords a perfect system of check in itself.

210. What is that system? If the work is too correct when balanced by calculation, suspicion will arise.

211. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—Suppose a man knew that, and made his measurements slightly different, what then? The field inspection is carried on as well.

212. *By the Chairman.*—If to prevent suspicion the surveyor does not show an absolute close, but a close approximate to it, how would it be detected then if there had been a falsification of the lines? By my field inspection.

213. If there was nothing in the diagrams to justify suspicion, would you be likely to go and inspect the work in the field? Yes.

214. In every case? In most cases; and the work would also be checked by standard lines that have been run in different parts of the colony which we have in the office, and the technical information of which surveyors do not know, or should not know.

215. Do you consider that the mode of inspection and system of check now in operation is sufficient to ensure satisfactory surveys? Yes, but we want more standard work.

216. Is it by that means you would have a better check in the office? Yes, and more correct plans.

217. Would it involve much additional cost to secure more standard work? No; I had some 60 miles done for me personally, for nothing.

218. In Tasmania? Yes.

219. Have you recommended the Department to have more standard work done? Yes; an especial survey vote is, or was intended for that purpose, but it has been gradually reduced of late.

220. Do you think it desirable that this vote should be reduced? No; we want more standard work done.

221. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—Is the amount of survey fees charged by Government paid to the surveyors, or only a portion of it? I think the surveyor gets the full amount paid for the surveys.

222. Is your inspecting staff sufficiently large to meet your views? Yes.
223. Do you think there is quite enough field inspection carried on? Yes; it is as much as they can do if they keep up with the present regulations.
224. On how many occasions did you visit Mr. Innes's district? Twice.
225. Are you aware that Mr. Innes has all the work south of Geeveston carried on by an assistant, or nearly all? I am told he has an assistant.
226. Have you been in the neighbourhood of Franklin? Not on duty of inspection.
227. Has any of the work of Mr. Innes's assistant been inspected? We look to Mr. Innes—assistants are not recognised.
228. Have you inspected any of the work done by Mr. Innes's assistant? I did, I believe, in the neighbourhood of Surges Bay, but Mr. Innes is responsible for all that work.
229. What was the character of the work you examined at Surges Bay? It was very rough country, and the chaining was good, and so was the marking.
230. Were these the surveys to which you referred in the report you furnished to the Department—the cases of Eaves and Cearns? I think so. I believe one line was badly marked, but I stated the price on salary.
231. Did you consider it a particularly rough piece of country? Yes.
232. As rough as any you have seen in the colony? I think I have seen equally rough.
233. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—Do you mean broken country or scrubby? I mean heavily timbered, broken, and with enormously large trees thrown down and interlaced—trees 10ft. thick to clamber over.
234. *By the Chairman.*—Have you inspected any surveys in Mr. Innes's district, south of Surges Bay? Immediately south I have, but not at Esperance or Recherche.
235. Do you consider it sufficient to inspect a few of the surveys in a district surveyor's district, without examining such as may have been done by his assistants? Hitherto I have gone where I have been instructed to go. It does not rest with me to say where I go; the surveys even are chosen for me.
236. Will that always be so, or will it not in future be left free, in your position as Inspector of Surveys, to visit districts and all parts of districts as you think desirable? I think that ought to be the case; it is most desirable.
237. Is it so in other colonies? Yes.
238. Does the amount of inspection you have done in the Franklin district correspond with what you have done in other surveyors' districts as to quantity? Yes.
239. That is to say, five or six surveys in each district represent the amount of inspection you have done? It would average from six to twelve, taken in different places.
240. During two years? I have only been inspecting field-work since September, 1885, till April, 1886.
241. Do you expect to do a similar or larger amount of field inspection each year in future? About a similar amount; then I have the standard work also to superintend.
242. Were the surveys you were sent to inspect in the Franklin district fairly representative of the class of country throughout that district? No, not all of them.
243. Have you been sufficiently through that district to be able to judge of the general character of the country? I think so; it is very rough generally.
244. In one of your reports to the department with regard to one of the surveys in Mr. Innes's district, you stated that £14 would be a fair remuneration for 100 acres; do you wish it to be understood that would be fair payment for every 100 acres in such class of country, or was there anything exceptional in that lot? I meant on salary. The block was easy of access, being on a tram-line.
245. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—Why could it be dearer done on salary? It might have been raining for a week previously.
246. *By the Chairman.*—What would have been a fair contract price? I would not care to work in that district at all on contract. At present the fee is £8 15s., but I should think from £14 to £20 per 100 acres would be a fair price.
247. When you say £14 or £20 would be fair payment for the survey of that particular lot, do you mean for the work as it was done, or as it should be done under the new regulations? As it should be done under the new regulations.
248. Do you think there was much fear of injury to the theodolite in surveying a block like that? There is always danger in every block.
249. Would the risk be greatly increased in that particular block? No, I do not think so.
250. In estimating a fair fee for surveys generally in that country, do you take into consideration risk of injury to the instruments? We never take into consideration risk of damage to instruments or loss of time.
251. Do you think that the objections to use the theodolite in that rough country arises from the risk incurred from damaging instruments? Partly that, and partly because the surveyor is obliged to carry the theodolite himself for safety.
252. On that score, do you think a higher scale of fees might be asked than when the compass is allowed? We do not recognise the compass at all; it should not be allowed.
253. Should the compulsory use of the theodolite entitle surveyors to a higher scale of fees than if the compass were allowed? Yes; but I take exception to the use of the compass at all.

254. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—Comparing Franklin with the North-West Coast, is it rougher or not so rough? I do not think there is much to choose; they are very similar districts.

255. *By the Chairman.*—Is there as much heavy fallen timber on the North-West Coast as in Franklin? No.

256. Is the country as broken? No, it is not so broken as the country about Esperance.

257. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—How would Franklin compare with Tasman's Peninsula? I saw some lots at the Peninsula quite as bad as those at Surges Bay, but it was at the head of the tram where the prisoners had felled the timber.

MR. C. P. SPRENT, *called and examined.*

258. *By the Chairman.*—What position do you occupy? Deputy Surveyor-General.

259. We would like you to inform us how far Mr. Black's recommendations have been carried out in regard to the system of payment for surveys? Since Mr. Black's report a series of regulations have been issued for the guidance of surveyors. These regulations in many cases are old and defunct regulations revived, but many new regulations have been added, the object being to bring the survey system of this Colony to a standard nearly approaching that of Victoria, as far as can be done in a heavily timbered country. The most important point in the new regulations is that all surveys must be brought to a mathematical close, in order that the value of the work may be checked in the office and also in the field. The survey fees, that is to say, the fees paid to surveyors for the work, remain the same as formerly, except that whereas formerly the amount paid for surveys was subject to a deduction of one-fourth in all joining work, and lightly timbered land was paid for at a less rate than heavily timbered land, these deductions have been abolished, and no deductions are now made.

260. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—Surveyors are required to do the work more carefully, but they are better paid? Yes.

261. In all separate surveys in rough country the payments remain as before? Yes.

262. *By the Chairman.*—What proportionate work is involved in carrying out the new regulations as compared with the former work? I cannot answer that question.

263. Take 100 acres in some of the roughest country, what proportionate amount of increased work would there be in working under the new regulations? I would insist on the survey being properly made under all circumstances. If a survey under the old regulations, faithfully made, was paid for at the rate of £8 15s. for 100 acre block, the work under the new regulations is fairly worth £10.

264. Would you consider £8 15s. for a 100 acre block, if faithfully done, sufficient payment? Yes.

265. As a matter of fact, there was not much insistence on the old regulations being observed? No, they had fallen into disuse.

266. And surveyors had regarded payment of fees as then made as applicable to the system of survey they had fallen into? They did their work much as they liked, provided it was passed and paid for; there was no possible check on it.

267. Do you think it likely that had the old regulations with the old fees been insisted on fully, that surveyors would have made much objection to them? They were always supposed to carry out the regulations. It was the lax system in the office that allowed them not to do so.

268. Was a copy of the old regulations always issued to surveyors on getting their appointment? I cannot say; it was supposed to be done; a copy was sent me on my first appointment.

269. As a matter of fact, there had been considerable laxity in the Department in regard to insistence on the old regulations being carried out? Yes.

270. Were Mr. Black's regulations as to payment for surveys carried out by the Department under the present regulations? Not entirely.

271. Do you think that his recommendations as to fees were excessive for the class of work he recommended? Not for the class of work he recommended, but we have no necessity for that class of work at present.

272. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—You think it too costly for this country? Yes, at present; we may advance to that bye-and-bye.

273. *By the Chairman.*—For the class of work now insisted on, do you consider the present payment sufficient? Scarcely.

274. Would that apply to the more open country? I take it all round: we made no distinction in open and heavy country. There is very little work done now in open country.

275. You think taking each district by itself, and the colony through, there is not very much difference in the character of the country? There may be in the character of the country, but taking the circumstances in each surveyor's work I consider that all, if any, are entitled to increased pay.

276. You think the fees at present are rather low? Yes.

277. Did Mr. Black see the various kinds of country before making his report? Yes. He proposed to have three scales—open country, heavily-timbered country, and very rough country. That would have brought us back to the difficulty we experienced under the old regulations, and would have increased that difficulty, inasmuch as it would have been difficult to satisfactorily determine under what scale the various surveys would be made. Some surveyors' consciences might be elastic as to what was light and what was

heavily-timbered country. It was the difficulty in separating them that led me to abandon the distinction. Still I think concessions should be made to the surveyors on account of the greater work involved under the new regulations.

278. Speaking generally, do you think the abolition of distinction for different payments for different classes of country has met with the approval of the surveyors? Yes, generally.

279. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—Do you think, taking all things into consideration, that the price paid would be equal in all districts? I do not think there is much difference; if the work is not heavy timber there are difficulties that counterbalance advantages.

280. Do you think the Regulations now in force are fairly complied with? Yes, so far as the reports of the Inspector lead me to believe. So far as I can judge, I think if the work is not quite up to regulations the work is being gradually brought up to that standard.

281. *By the Chairman.*—You have reason to believe there is improvement in the work in most, if not all, the districts? Yes, in all districts I may say there is very great improvement.

282. Have you received officially many complaints as to insufficient remuneration obtained by the scale of fees for the improved class of work? I have had complaints from Mr. Innes, and I have been informed by Mr. Chalmers that he found it very difficult to make a living in his district. With these exceptions I have not heard complaints.

283. Is the character of Mr. Chalmers' work generally good? The first inspection made disclosed the fact that his surveys were not being satisfactorily made, but on subsequent inspections the Inspector reports the work is being faithfully performed.

284. When you say faithfully performed, do you mean up to the present regulations? Such of it as we have inspected has been up to present regulations.

285. Do you know of any other district in which the work is actually up to the regulations? Taking it generally all round it appears to be. Of course the number of surveys we inspect is a very small proportion of what the surveyors do, and although we have had to complain of inaccuracies I believe they are the exception.

286. Do you believe the marking in every case has improved? With one exception, the Inspector's report says the marking is well done.

287. Is the theodolite used in every district except Mr. Innes's? So far as I am aware, Yes.

288. How do you find out what instruments they use? The Inspector examines the theodolite, and calls on each surveyor to produce it.

289. Do you not think it possible to use the compass and still produce the theodolite? He would be an eccentric man who would use the circumferentor in preference to a theodolite in heavy country. I cannot understand a surveyor doing so.

290. How is it Mr. Innes objects to use the theodolite? I put it down as an eccentricity of his.

291. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—Is it not more difficult to take a theodolite about in rough country? Yes, it would be; but the work is very much more expeditiously and accurately done with the theodolite.

292. *By the Chairman.*—Have you reason to believe that Mr. Innes's is the only district in which the compass is used? Yes; and I would be very sorry to think he used it on all occasions.

293. Have you had any formal protest against working under the new regulations, excepting from Mr. Innes? No.

294. Had you any complaints from him against working under the new regulations? No. When the new regulations came into force he simply refused to be bound by them.

295. What steps were taken relative to the protest? He was told he might go on under the old regulations until we had an opportunity of examining his work.

296. Has that examination been made? Partly.

297. What result has followed? I was not satisfied with the information received, and I gave orders for another examination.

298. Has that been made? It has been ordered, but not executed.

299. Is there anything in the correspondence between Mr. Innes and the Department which ought to be laid before the Committee? I think I had better lay before the Committee the minute submitted by me to the Minister on Mr. Innes's case. (The correspondence in question was then tabled).

300. The correspondence now laid on the table, together with the minutes, indicate the position occupied immediately prior to Mr. Innes's petition being received? Yes.

301. Was the case under consideration when Mr. Innes's petition was tabled? Yes.

302. Has anything been done since? No; action was then suspended.

303. Do you know whether he has been carrying on his work in similar style since the new regulations came into force, or has he worked on an improved style? I believe his work has improved.

304. Are you prepared to say whether his work, prior to the new regulations coming into force, generally gave satisfaction? It was not satisfactory.

305. Was it less so than that of the surveyors generally? I believe it was, from the enquiries I have made in the Department.

306. Was Mr. Innes acquainted with the dissatisfaction of the Department? I cannot say.

307. Since you became Deputy-Surveyor General has there been any intimation to him that his work was unsatisfactory? No.

308. Has there been any special occasion of complaint of Mr. Innes's work since the new regulations came into force? We have not inspected it sufficiently to obtain a clear idea of its value.

309. Have you seen Mr. Innes's petition? Yes, I have a copy.

310. In that he expresses generally the position he has taken up with regard to the Department? His petition is merely an echo of his last address to the Department, which I have traversed in the papers I have submitted.

311. Have you had occasion to regard the attitude Mr. Innes has taken up in his correspondence as objectionable? I might fairly take exception to the tone of his letters to the Department, but Mr. Innes being a very old surveyor under the Department I have wished to deal justly and considerately with him.

312. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Do you mean rather leniently? Yes. Generally speaking, the papers I have put in will show the position I have taken up, and I would wish to add a few words in explanation. I gather from the petition there are two points at issue. One is, that the survey fees generally are insufficient; the other is that the Huon district is an especially rough district, and therefore Mr. Innes's surveys should be paid for at a higher rate than those of other surveyors. The first point I am prepared to admit. As already stated in evidence, I think the survey fees generally should be increased, but the difficulty I see is to decide who is to pay the increased cost. It would be unfair to expect the selectors to pay it, and I have no hope of getting any further sums from the General Revenue. Then, as to the second point—that the Huon is a particularly rough district—I have already stated in my evidence that, considering the various circumstances attending the work of district surveyors generally, I do not think there is much to choose between the districts. I am of opinion that if Mr. Innes is unable to make a living in the Franklin district it is mainly owing to the fact that he does very few of his surveys himself. For instance: out of 90 surveys made in the Franklin district between February 1885 and February 1886, 48 were made by Mr. Innes himself and 42 by his assistants. The number of surveys made by Mr. Innes includes 9 small town allotments, so that in reality he only made 39 sectional surveys out of 81, and as the amount of survey fees amounted to £481 8s. it would be impossible for three men to get a living out of that work.

313. Do you mean three surveyors? Yes; Mr. Innes and two qualified assistants.

314. *By the Chairman.*—Do you think any one surveyor could have done that work in a year? Certainly.

315. What number of assistants—chainmen, &c.—would be necessary? Two would be sufficient.

316. You think there would be no just grounds for serious complaint as to payment if Mr. Innes occupied himself fully with the work put into his hands? I think so, bearing in mind that I have advocated an increased pay all round.

317. *By Mr. Dooley.*—In altering the scale of fees would it not be advisable to keep to the scale and raise the fees proportionately? I would raise the £8 15s. fee to £10, and so on proportionately.

318. *By the Chairman.*—Do you at all regard your permission to Mr. Innes to continue his work under protest as to any extent an admission of the justice of his claims for largely increased payment of fees in view of the peculiar character of his district? I wanted to satisfy myself as to the alleged peculiar character of the district.

319. Have you had sufficient investigation yet to fully satisfy you? No.

320. Do you remember if one of the lots Mr. Hardy went to inspect had been reported by Mr. Innes as being worth £30 to survey 100 acres—do you remember the result of that inspection? I cannot remember exactly. Mr. Hardy can tell you. Mr. Hardy, I know, did not agree with Mr. Innes.

321. Did Mr. Hardy estimate the work as worth £14 in such country? Yes; I now remember he did.

322. Would you regard such a lot as being exceptionally rough? From the report, I take it to be an exceptionally rough block; but you must take the work right through the district on an average.

323. In his petition Mr. Innes expresses the opinion that by altering the system of payment somewhat, all the surveyors could be more equitably paid, and the whole cost of the surveys not be more than at present: do you concur in that opinion? He simply makes an affirmation—he does not formulate it in any shape. I do not agree with that affirmation.

324. Do you prefer the system of payment by contract to having salaried surveyors? I prefer the contract system to the salaried system.

325. Is not the salaried system in operation in the other colonies? It is in some, but not in others.

326. Do you know why it should operate satisfactorily in other colonies and not here? We would require a much more expensive staff, both in the office and the field, to control the surveys. The land laws in other colonies provide for survey before selection; but in Tasmania it is selection before survey.

327. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Have you a copy of the old regulations? Not here; but I will send you a copy if necessary.

328. Does your Inspector know anything about them? No; they were superseded before he commenced inspection.

329. Do you know what percentage the surveyors give their assistants who are authorised surveyors, who work for them? It varies; some give 75 per cent., some 50, and some give them the full fees.

330. Can you furnish a return showing what the assistants receive? No; we cannot interfere with them to that extent. It is a private matter between themselves.

331. Might not a great wrong exist by some surveyors paying only half rates? That is nothing to do with us.

332. Would not the inequality of payment affect the quality of work? We look to the district surveyors to keep up the quality of the work.

333. Suppose the colony were redivided, could you not let a quota to each district surveyor that would keep him going?—would it not be better to appoint one of these surveyors to each district, and let him do the work? I do not think so—the work comes in rushes; some of them would not be fully employed.

334. Is not that the case now? Yes; two or three surveyors have more than they can do, and others have little. Those who have no work in arrears we send to those who have too much.

335. Would it not be better to re-distribute the districts? It would not be fair to those old surveyors who have worked hard to open their districts.

336. Is there any other mode of consideration for surveyors if you have no work? You could only leave them their work.

337. Was not the district Mr. Chalmers has carved out of two other districts? Yes.

338. How does it answer? It is a small district, and the work is done under great difficulties. All the work is now driven up into the hills, and it is very difficult.

339. Is he fully employed? Yes; but his work is so scattered and isolated, that it is difficult for him to do the work and make a profit.

MR. H. J. CHALMERS, *called and examined.*

340. *By the Chairman.*—What position do you occupy? District Surveyor for Devon and Westmorland.

341. Have you had charge of that district long? Six or seven years.

342. Had you a district prior to that? No.

343. Did you have experience prior to that? Yes, in Tasmania and New Zealand.

344. Have you had long experience as a surveyor? 18 or 20 years.

345. Are you kept fully employed in the district you have? Yes; I have been fully employed ever since I have been in the district.

346. What is the character of the country? Mountainous; most of it broken, with heavy timber and scrub.

347. Is there much large fallen timber? Yes, a great deal, especially in some places.

348. Have you found the requirements under the new regulations, issued in 1884, at all oppressive? Yes, very much so.

349. In what respect particularly? It takes longer to make a survey than it formerly did.

350. Generally speaking, can you say what proportion longer? It takes twice as long to do the work under the new regulations than it did under the old system, speaking generally.

351. Is that because of better marking or larger clearing? No; because we are obliged to work round the trees and obstacles.

351A. Is your marking now difficult? No.

352. Did you work with the compass or theodolite before the new regulations came in? With the theodolite—I never used the compass-box.

353. Did you raise any objections to work under the new regulations? None whatever. I hailed them with pleasure, as something thoroughly required.

354. But as involving compliance with them gave so much additional work, were you satisfied with the regulations? No, I was not; but I waited for two years to see what the effect would be, and then I wrote to the Minister.

355. When did you write? About two months ago, asking him, if he was unable to redress my grievances, that he would give me another position. The Minister replied there was nothing then offering.

356. What was the nature of your objection? That I was not able to make a living at the fees allowed me.

357. Have your payments at all improved since the new regulations came into force? Very little. There was a slight cessation of deduction; but the blocks are more scattered, and very little improvement is made. Where two or three new surveys were made together, a deduction was formerly made of one fourth for the dividing lines. To the extent that such deductions are no longer made where surveys are thus united, we are benefited.

358. What amount of benefit would you receive in a year from the increase in abolishing the deduction? About £10 or £12 per year, perhaps not that. I would consider that a favorable amount.

359. Does that at all compensate you for the work you have to do? I have to work 15 or 16 hours a day in summer, and do not average £3 per week. My last year's earnings did not amount to £170 after paying expenses, including camp expenses.

360. If you had been working under the old regulations with the same amount of work to do, what would have been your earnings in the same time? From £300 to £400.

361. You are only earning about half? Yes, hardly half, and in some cases I have been a considerable loser. In a great many cases during last year I have been a considerable loser. All previous savings, about £150, I have lost.

362. *By Mr. Dooley.*—The benefits derivable from boundary lines is unappreciable as a whole, is it not? Yes, the benefit is so small as to be unappreciable.

363. Have you any country in your district that would have been considered open country under the old regulations? Yes, in the Lake Country, but I have not worked in it. To get to the open country in my district I would have to travel a great distance, and that would leave me no profit.

364. Has the Inspector visited your district at all? Yes, he and his assistant have been there pretty often, but I have not seen his report. I applied to the Department for a copy of his report, but the Deputy Surveyor-General refused to let me have it. I, however, received the following from the Deputy Surveyor-General:—

Crown Lands Office, Hobart, March 2nd, 1886.

MEMO.

The Inspector of Surveys having examined some of Mr. Chalmers' recent surveys expresses himself highly pleased with the way the lines are marked and the regulations carried out. He also reports that Mr. Chalmers' instruments are kept in correct adjustment.

The Deputy Surveyor-General desires to express to Mr. Chalmers his gratification to find that these matters receive his careful attention.

CHAS. P. SPRENT, *Deputy Surveyor-General.*

H. J. CHALMERS, *Esq., District Surveyor, Deloraine.*

For all repairs to instruments we have to send to Melbourne, and pay duty on them. We also pay travelling expenses on all railways, including the Government lines, and every other item.

365. *By the Chairman.*—You say you have cleared only £170 out of nearly £400: how is it the expenses run into so much? It is the wages and general expenses; wages are so much higher than they used to be. Then there is loss of time through bad weather, and through instruments going wrong, with the excessive cost of repairing them.

366. Do you think from the requirement of a better class of work, and increased rates of wages prevailing, you are justified in claiming higher pay? I think so.

367. Do you know the views of any other surveyors regarding the rate of payment? They are of the same opinion as I am, and are now propagating an association to place their views and grievances before the Minister. I believe they have written to the Minister, who states there are surveyors employing assistants to do the work at 75 per cent. That is true, but the assistants are independent men, and, from what I have learned, out of the 75 per cent. they do not make expenses. They make nothing out of it.

368. Did you see Mr. Black's recommendations as to scale of payment? No.

369. From what you know of the country generally do you think there ought to be a sliding scale for open country? No, not now; I think all the open country has been taken up.

370. What would you think a fair rate to pay for surveys? £12 15s. for 100 acres, and £20 to £25 for 320 acres.

371. Could surveyors do fairly well at these rates? Yes, but they would not be overpaid.

372. Do you imagine such rates would satisfy other surveyors? I am certain they would.

373. Would they be prepared to act up to the regulations for those rates? I think so—I would, speaking individually.

374. Do you know enough of the character of the work of other surveyors to know if it is up to regulations? In my district the work is done fairly well; it is better now than it was in former times.

375. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Is there any particular regulation for going round trees? Yes, from a measured triangle or parallel line by the limb of the instrument, not with the eye.

376. In your opinion is that the most correct system? Is it for going round such obstacles? I should think it is impossible to close up a survey without instrumental work.

377. How many chains do you use as base? Not less than 2½ chains; anything less would be liable to error with a 5-inch theodolite.

378. Without very good ground, to lay out your triangle are you not liable to err? Yes, a parallel line would be more correct.

379. Could that be done with the eye? I do not think so—it should be done with the instrument. I think you should work right round the tree with the instrument. I do it by a parallel line myself. That is what occupies the time.

380. Was your district carved out of two others? I do not know.

381. What was the effect of that?—have you not a greater knowledge of the country now? I think so. It was a very large area before, and the carving out of a new district made a great improvement.

382. Could not that system be carried out with advantage in other districts? I do not know.

383. *By the Chairman.*—If the fees for surveys should not be raised, do you think you would be able to continue your position as district surveyor? I do not think so.

384. Do you think you could do better elsewhere? I would try hard to get a situation somewhere. I would now take £250 per year, with a chance of a possible rise, rather than keep my district, and I have never been short of work.

MR. HERBERT COOMBES, *examined.*

385. *By the Chairman.*—You are a District Surveyor? Yes, in part of Buckingham.
386. How long have you had that district? About 2 years.
387. Have you been surveying previous to having this district in your own hands? Yes, in the same district: it was my father's district previously.
388. What has been the length of your experience? About 20 years.
389. Have you been surveying in any other district? Yes; I have been up at Moorina, at the tin mines, and down at Scottsdale.
390. Do you regard the Huon district as being exceptionally rough? Yes, it is.
391. More so than Scottsdale or Moorina? Yes.
392. Was your district in your hands prior to the new regulations being issued? No.
393. Did your father work under the new regulations at all? He did, for about six months.
394. Had he any special reason for giving up the district? It was because he was fit for the work no longer; he was too old.
395. It was not because of the difficulty of working profitably under the new regulations? No, I think not.
396. You succeeded your father? Yes.
397. Is the work required of you under the new regulations much more particular and exact than under the old? It takes about twice as long as it did formerly. Where it now takes two men, you might have done it in half the time with one.
398. Can you briefly indicate the causes of the extra time being taken up? You have to clear the land much more carefully, and chain it; and the marking is much more than it was formerly. It takes twice as long to mark as it did formerly.
399. Has the Inspector visited your district since you had charge of it? Yes; and I have a very good report of my work—as good as you could wish to have.
400. How many blocks of your survey has he inspected? I think about 10 or 12.
401. Would that be in the roughest part of your district? Some were in the roughest part, and others were cleared lands.
402. What is your opinion of the present rates of payment? I do not think that they are sufficient for the work we have to do and the hardships we have to put up with.
403. Have you any advantage as to payments under the new regulations as compared with the old? A slight advantage in the case of continuous surveys: whereas formerly there was a deduction made where boundaries joined, now there is no deduction. That is the only advantage we have.
404. Have you any advantage arising in the matter of surveys in the open country? Very little, because we have not much open country. The scrub you can get rid of; but the trees take a long time to get round.
405. What would you consider a fair rate of payment for surveys in such country as you have, for 100 acres? I should think about £12.
406. What would be a fair payment up to 320 acres? £20; but I have not gone into the matter carefully. There is another thing. We have many 25 acre lands, for which only £3 2s. 6d. is paid, and it takes very nearly as long as 50 acre blocks. On one or two occasions I have had to go and survey such lots, and lost money by it after paying for men and horses.
407. Do you think that, taking the colony through, the fees you suggest could be fairly claimed, or would your remarks apply only to the rougher country, such as the Huon? There are other parts of the country, some places round Scottsdale and Moorina, quite as rough as in the Huon; but where I was surveying, taking the general run, it was better surveying and much leveller country.
408. From the tenor of your last answer I judge you think the fees in such a country as the Huon ought to be exceptionally high? No; I do not think that the work could be done anywhere for much less to make it pay.
409. Have you had much exchange of opinion with other surveyors as to the fees? No.
410. Do you think that, generally speaking, the surveyors are satisfied or dissatisfied? The whole of them are dissatisfied; they were either paid too much before, or they are not paid enough now.
411. You do not think that you were too much paid before? No, I do not. Last year I made between £500 and £600, but I had plenty of work, and out of that I had to pay two men, keep a horse, and pay all travelling expenses. My men cost about £4 10s. a-week.
412. What might be your net profit for your own work during the year? About £250.
413. That would be after paying all expenses of survey? Yes, and with a constant supply of work. I had as much work as I could do, and very good work too—better work than the generality. I had to survey a lot of poor land on immigration certificates. Most of those immigrants' certificates are 54s., some 50s. and 30s.; then they take up land near roads, and do not mind what it is, so long as it is land. That made me do much better; but I do not think I could do so well next year.
414. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Do you sublet any of your work? Not any. I did give a young fellow a few lots to survey for me, but I would not do it again.
415. Do you deem it more profitable and otherwise better to do the work yourself than let it? To do Surveys.

it yourself. I do not think you would get anything out of it by subletting, and, in my experience, you cannot get the work done either, and all the same you are responsible.

416. Then, in case one district surveyor is unable to do the work within his district, and is obliged to employ assistance, do you think it would be well to divide the district and make it into two, or add part of it to another district? I do not think so. It would be much better to allow that surveyor to employ another surveyor and give him full fees, and allow the district to remain as it was. Supposing I had too much work I could go to another surveyor who had not any work and give him the surplus, taking nothing for myself, because very probably the rush of work would only be for a short time? If the district was divided into two there might not be enough to do for two surveyors. When a district surveyor has too much work the Department sends another district surveyor.

417. Are you aware that some district surveyors have not nearly enough to do, and are not employed the whole year round? I do not think so, at the present time. Mr. Thomson, I know, has not had sufficient work, but he has been working in another district—in Mr. Windsor's.

418. You say you keep up to the regulations as well as you possibly can? I have worked up to the regulations. I have had my work inspected, and it was done up to the letter.

419. When you said you worked up to the regulations as well as you possibly could, that would imply that there are instances where you could not work up to them? There are some places where it would be impossible.

420. Do those instances frequently occur in your district? Not very frequently.

421. You say you got a very good report—what do you mean by that? Mr. Hardy had been down at my district, and afterwards Mr. Sprent wrote to me saying that Mr. Hardy had reported to him that he had inspected some of my recent work and that it was all well and faithfully done, and he was very pleased with all he had seen.

422. Do you think that all sorts of land should be paid for at the same rate? I never see any clear land now; there is not any left in Tasmania.

423. Therefore you think that uniform fees per acre are fair? Yes; most of the clear portion is private property.

424. Then the only thing you say about the fees is that they are low or insufficient? Yes.

425. Do you know of any surveyors who have done better than you? I cannot say I do. I know other surveyors have done of late more work than I have, but they have employed assistance, and I do not know what they pay those assistants.

426. Do I understand you to disapprove of the system of paying a percentage below maximum price to assistants? It is a thing I would not do myself.

427. Have you any reason? I do not think you get sufficient profit out of it to compensate for the risk. I would rather, when there was a rush of work, employ a district surveyor and give him the same fees.

428. Has the boundary of your district been defined for you on the chart? I have not been furnished with a chart, but I know pretty well the bounds of my district.

429. Do you send in an annual report to the office of the whole of the Crown estate and the progress of settlement? Yes.

430. With that report do you send an estimate of the available Crown land remaining in the district? Yes.

431. What instructions do you get in reference to those annual reports? The report is furnished under the regulations, which say that at the end of each year a surveyor shall be required to make up a report of the settlement in his district and the available Crown land.

432. What is your opinion of appointing salaried surveyors instead of payment by fees? I do not think it would be as good; I do not think it would be advisable. I think it would cost more, and you would not get so much work done.

433. *By Mr. M'Kenzie.*—What is the difference in chaining now to what it was formerly? You have to be much more careful.

434. Was the work formerly done inaccurate? In a great many cases it was. I think that it is quite time something was done, and I think it is a very good thing, this alteration.

435. You think a great deal of former work was not properly done? Yes, in a loose and slovenly manner, and not properly done.

436. I think you made reference to timber obstruction? Yes; it makes a difference in chaining, staking, and clearing. The standing timber is an obstruction you have to pass with a theodolite; formerly, when it was surveyed by a compass, you could go to the other side of the tree.

437. You say that most of your work are isolated blocks, so that you have not the advantage offered by the Department in regard to continuous surveys? Yes. It is very seldom I have two lots together.

438. Supposing you surveyed a lot this year, and twelve months afterwards you survey a lot contiguous, are you paid for it? Yes.

439. You are aware that there has been as high as 75 per cent. paid assistants? Yes. That was instead of paying wages. I never did that, nor did my father.

440. Have you been in any other parts of the island except Scottsdale? I have been down at Swansea and thereabouts surveying for a short time.

441. The country you have, has it a thick growth and under scrub? Yes, and it is very broken and hilly.

442. What is the scrub growing there? Native willow, musk, dogwood, &c.

442A. *By Mr. Dooley.*—You have said that the work was badly done: do you mean prior to the issue of the present regulations? Yes; the line was not cleared or marked well.

443. Were you acquainted with the regulations in force immediately prior to the present regulations? I have heard of those regulations, but never saw them, but I believe they were quite as strict as the regulations now.

444. Then this bad work must have been done in contravention of the then regulations? Yes.

445. So that if surveyors could then do bad work, and were of the same disposition now, they could still evade the regulations and do bad work? They could not do it now, because we have an Inspector.

446. If a dishonest man chose, he could fly over the work as formerly if he did not dread the Inspector? Yes.

447. *By the Chairman.*—Don't you think that there is a better check in the office now? There is a better check, but still they cannot tell in the office how the work is done on the ground.

448. *By Mr. Dooley.*—In all former regulations you had to close with a limit of error: there is nothing more in the new regulations than that the amount of error may be limited? Yes.

449. So that the work formerly done, if honestly done, would always be passable? Yes.

450. Then the marking you found deficient, if done according to the then regulations, would not have been deficient? No, it would not.

451. The supervision now is more strict in regard to chaining and marking? Yes, those things are being enforced now. Before, the regulations were not carried out.

452. *By Mr. M'Kenzie.*—What is the difference in the marking now? You have to mark much better than before; you have to mark the trees better, and clear the line better.

453. Is there anything in the new regulations about measuring round trees? No, there is not; you just measure round them the best way you can.

454. Have you been in the district held by Mr. Innes? Yes, I know his district well: it is very similar to my own, but not any worse.

455. *By Mr. Dooley.*—You say in passing trees you have to get round the best way you can. Suppose you heard another surveyor say you were limited to two prescribed rules under the present regulations, using the theodolite only, and working round by square or triangle, would you consider that you were so bound under the regulations? No; it is not described how you shall pass a tree, only you are bound to use a theodolite, whereas formerly a compass was used.

456. *By the Chairman.*—You are aware that Mr. Innes has objected to work under the new regulations? Yes, I have heard him say so.

457. Are you familiar with any of his work? Not any.

458. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Do you prefer the system of getting round trees by parallel lines or by triangulation? By parallel lines.

459. *By the Chairman.*—Which involves most labour? Triangulation.

460. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Which do you think brings about the best result? Parallel lines.

461. *By Mr. M'Kenzie.*—Then it is the easiest and most accurate? Yes.

462. *By Mr. Dooley.*—The parallel may be done by measurement alone? Yes.

463. And that is where the survey comes in? Yes.

EDWARD ALBERT COUNSEL, *examined.*

464. *By the Chairman.*—What are you? I am District Surveyor at Oatlands.

465. How long have you had charge? I was appointed in November, 1880.

466. Have you surveyed much in other parts of the colony besides that district? Not much, with the exception of some mining surveys in 1881 in the Ringarooma district since my appointment as District Surveyor.

467. Have you done any surveying in the other colonies? No.

468. What is the character of the country you have to survey in your district? It is moderately open. Most of it is what is considered open. There are a great many large trees, but not very thick scrub as a rule.

469. Have you been required to carry out an improved class of work since the present regulations came into force? Yes; I think that altogether the present regulations have entailed one half more work.

470. You do not get one half more pay? There is no commensurate increase in the pay. Years ago when Dr. Butler was Minister of Lands we had one fourth taken from adjoining surveys; this has been altered, and we have been allowed to obtain the full fee for adjoining surveys; but this affects my district very slightly, as there are few adjoining surveys.

471. If the whole had been open country you would not have got the same rate of payment as now? No; there were two classes—100 acres were paid at £7, and now at £8 15s.; whereas £8 15s. is charged all round now.

472. The most of the country in your district, I believe, was open? It is an open question about open country, because trees moderately thick may be considered heavy country.

473. Then, taking it block for block, would you consider you received much increased benefit now above what you have had before? A little in my district, because I would have charged the lightly-timbered prices generally.

474. Viewing the increased amount of work, and the comparatively small increase of pay, do you consider that the present rates of payment are satisfactory? No; I do not think that they are nearly commensurate with the additional information asked for now. We are carrying out almost such a survey as that recommended by Mr. Black, Deputy Surveyor-General for Victoria, who suggested a much higher rate of fees.

475. Did you offer any objection, or ask a new scale or increase of pay? No, I never made any objection. I was asked by some of the surveyors if I would join a protest; that was soon after the new regulations. I said then that I would join in any moderate measure, but that it would be better to give the new regulations a trial; and nothing has been done since.

476. Is there any intention of forming such a deputation? Not that I am aware of. I have heard of it several times, but it has never seemed to take any definite form.

477. Would you consider that the fees such as Mr. Black recommends would be fair? Yes, reasonably fair.

478. What, in your idea, is a fair payment per 100 acres? £10.

479. And 320 acres? About £20.

480. Would you approve of the three classes of fees that he recommended, or would you rather have all put under one class? I think that is just the objection of it. I think it ought all to be one class, and that it would be more reasonable to have one fee, because lightly-timbered districts require, as a rule, much more travelling. I have a lot in my district at present that would necessitate a week's travelling to the spot and thence to another survey. In heavily-timbered country the surveys are closer together.

481. Do you think that there ought be some allowance for mileage, or would you be satisfied if there was a fair rate of payment for surveys all round? I would be in favour of a fair rate for surveys.

482. Have you been much over the colony so as to be able to judge of the different classes of country? Yes; I have surveyed several districts.

483. Have you been at the Huon? No.

484. Which are the roughest districts you are acquainted with? Well, there is scarcely any difference between Scottsdale and Wellington districts; the Bischoff is the roughest.

485. If a surveyor's work lay almost wholly in such a district as the Scottsdale, or the Wellington and Mount Bischoff districts, would you think he would be entitled to larger fees than the fees you have named? Yes, in Bischoff, I should say so.

486. In Scottsdale? No.

487. Have you heard the views of many surveyors since they had a year or two's trial of the present system? No.

488. To what extent do you think the change will affect your income, remembering what you made under the old system? The work is nearly one-half more than before, but a good deal of this additional work is done at night.

489. That is, if you make £200 now, you could have made £300 then? Yes.

490. Do you think that you were too well paid before? No; I never heard of any surveyor making a fortune before, and we have to work harder now for less.

491. Can you give us an idea of your receipts? I have got here three years' receipts for the years 1883, 1884, and 1885. The total receipts for those years were £1667. Deducting wages from that left £1067. There also had to be deducted £170 for an assistant, bringing it down to £897, giving an average of £299 for each year, including travelling expenses, which expenses are very heavy in my district.

492. That embraces part of the old system and part of the new? Yes, if calculations were done during the day.

493. But it does not give a comparison of what your earnings might be under the old system, as compared with the new? No.

494. Would you think that the system of salaried surveyors would be practical here? I do not think it would, because I am afraid there would be no likelihood of the Government giving such salaries as district surveyors would accept.

495. Have you been fully employed last year? Yes, very fully; I have not been a week idle.

496. What would be your receipts for that year? £759 13s. 7d.; but out of that there would be considerable deductions for labour, travelling and other expenses: this included the assistance of an advanced pupil, who was competent to take charge of a party.

497. The only advantage you would recommend under the present system is that the fees be raised somewhat? Yes, salaries would be more satisfactory in regard to work if they were commensurate.

498. Do you think that better work could be got under salaried surveyors than under the contract system? Yes, certainly.

499. Has the Inspector inspected any of your work? Yes, I think some four sections.

500. Did he express himself satisfied? I believe so. The report was favourable, but I was not present when he made the inspection.

501. *By Mr. Dooley.*—Have you got a defined district of your own? Yes.
502. Do you employ any assistants? Not now. I did during a part of last year and this year.
503. Did you find it profitable to employ assistants? It was not so in my case. I had only one assistant. I deducted 8 per cent. as a nominal fee for inspection and responsibility.
504. Do you think 8 per cent. covered the time and care you bestowed upon his work before it was sent in? So far I had not much more to do than visit the country and look over some of the surveys, as he was a qualified surveyor, and approved of by the Department.
505. You work entirely under the new system now? Yes.
506. Were you acquainted with the old system that obtained immediately before this? Yes, I have been surveying since 1872.
507. Where do you recognise a difference in the two systems? In respect to the roads there is a considerable difference. At the present time you have to run a transverse rod through the centre of the road and mark off the angles; then the marking is a little more particular—larger marks, and more of them are insisted upon. When I was appointed district surveyor there were no regulations furnished for me to work up to. I believe that some years ago there were regulations about marking similar to the present, but they were not adhered to as far as I know. Then there is a difference in respect to the closing of work. Every lot has to be closed, and in the case of township allotments it may take hours to do the work, and it requires to be done on the ground.
508. You said all the roads are to be marked in the centre? Yes.
509. Suppose that road was cleared next day, what would become of the marks? They would be all destroyed, and probably the pegs also.
510. If that road were lined fronting the allotment, would not the marks be more likely to remain permanent? Yes.
511. Would it be any inconvenience in any respect to any parties concerned to have it so marked on the side? No.
512. Therefore it would be much better than the present system of marking in the centre? Yes; it would be no increase of time or labour marking one side.
513. It would be better for the selector? Yes; it would define his boundary more permanently.
514. Do you know what is the prescribed system for passing large trees or obstacles? It is not compulsory any particular way, but it is almost necessary to use an instrument. A parallel line by putting up three stakes is fairly accurate for level country, but there is a liability to error in steep country.
515. It is not described the exact mode you shall do it? No.
516. What do you prefer in getting round a tree, producing your line by triangles or parallelograms? By triangulation.
517. *By Mr. Mackenzie.*—Have you seen most of the districts in the colony? Yes.
518. Do you think that they are fairly proportioned to the surveyors? I think so.
519. In considering the cost of work would you consider the inaccessibility of the district—for instance, although the country might be more open, it might be more remote from centres of population where you get your supplies? Yes, there is one exception, that is Russell. I think it is hardly fair to class that with the rest, as it is so very much out of the way and very rough.
520. You think that that is the only district worth special mention? Yes.
521. What is the difference between the marking now and that formerly? The custom formerly was to put three marks in every tree within one yard of the line; but it was not compulsory to put in three heavy triangles as now. In many cases there were no triangular marks at all.
522. In chaining is there any difference under the new regulations? Yes; you have to take much more time, through the simple fact that you have to close to much greater accuracy. It must be less than 1 in 400, whereas 1 in 200 used to be the test.
523. Is it possible to close without error? Yes, in small allotments.
524. I suppose you would not manage it in rough country? No.
-

APPENDIX A.

To the Honorable the Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly.

The Petition of George Innes, of Franklin, holding the official position of "District Surveyor" for South Huon.

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH :

THAT your Petitioner has been employed as a Surveyor for nearly thirty years, during the chief part of which time he has been working in thickly timbered, broken, and difficult country, involving much expense and toil ; and in which, owing to the low prices paid for surveys under the contract scale, but a very small professional income could be realised, and consequently, although now at an advanced age, is still dependent upon employment in his profession for the means of supporting himself and family.

That somewhat more than two years ago, Mr. Alexander Black, of Victoria, was engaged by the Government to report upon the Survey System of Tasmania ; and in consequence of that Report it was intimated to the Surveyors that the work would in future have to be performed in a much more careful and accurate manner than formerly. Special " Regulations " were issued, imposing considerable additional labor, both in office and in the field, and notice was given that surveys would in future be paid for under a revised scale of fees then published, by which scale the classification hitherto existing with regard to " open country " and " heavily timbered " surveys was abolished, the fees paid for *all* surveys being now fixed at the same rates as were formerly paid, only for those effected in the heavily timbered and rough districts.

That immediately upon receipt of a copy of these Regulations your Petitioner addressed the Head of the Department in which he is employed, *positively refusing* to conform to them, pointing out the manifest " injustice " of the Amended Scale of Fees, inasmuch as it secures increased emolument *only* to those surveyors who, working under circumstances of much less difficulty and cost, were previously *doubtly paid* in proportion to your Petitioner, of whom was demanded by the Regulations a very much superior class of work at the same rate of pay as before. Your Petitioner, therefore, objected, that he was required to perform actual " impossibilities," and declined to carry on the survey work of his district, asking for an " investigation " as to the truth of his statements of the exceptional difficulty and cost of surveys at the Huon, suggesting, as a practical test, that surveys should be effected—under the personal supervision of the Inspector—of certain of the lots for which your Petitioner then held instructions, affirming that if such lots were surveyed strictly in accordance with the requirements of the new Regulations the cost would prove to be so great that the absurdity of expecting your Petitioner to do the work for the fees proposed to be paid would be at once apparent.

That, in reply, it was intimated to your Petitioner that " an early opportunity " would be taken of investigating his complaint, but that in the meantime he might disregard the Regulations in question.

That in April of last year (1885), your Petitioner addressed His Excellency the Governor-in-Council, by Memorial and Appendices, showing that during the seven months which had elapsed since the issue of the new Regulations, your Petitioner had endeavoured to conform to them so far as it was possible to do so at any reasonable cost, with the result that your Petitioner and his assistants had found themselves unable to earn anything approaching to professional pay.

That no reply to this Memorial has been received by your Petitioner, and no " investigation " has been made, but in the Report of the Inspector of Surveys for 1886 (*vide* line 13, page 10, of Mr. Sprent's Annual Report for this year) your Petitioner is referred to as the " one surveyor " who objects to " conform to the Regulations at the present scale of fees, and has continued to survey in the old style, with compass or circumferentor," and your Petitioner submits—that the fact of his having been allowed for two years to set at defiance the Regulations of his Department, to which all the other Surveyors in the Colony are said to have conformed, is in itself positive proof that the statement of your Petitioner, as to the entirely exceptional character of the survey work in his district, are now recognised to be of weight, and that consequently his request for a practical test to ascertain the fair value of the class of work he is required to perform, is not an unreasonable one.

That Mr. Black, whose report upon the Survey System of Tasmania has been previously mentioned by your Petitioner, refers in some very practical and pertinent remarks to this very question of payment for surveys, and (*vide* page 9 of his Report) says " I consider the present scale of fees inadequate and somewhat unequal in its application," and proceeds to point out that if better work is demanded, " more time and labor will be requisite, and *the surveyor must be paid accordingly*." He then goes on to " recommend," not that all surveys should be paid for alike, whether in open plain (such as tin mining sections on the West Coast) or dense, rough, and difficult country—but that for purpose of survey, lands should be divided into three, instead of two classes, and that the survey fees for the third-class (very rough country, such as, for instance, is rather the rule than exception in the Huon district) should be fixed at about 50 *per cent.* higher than those ruling at the time of his visit to Tasmania. In view of these remarks of Mr. Black, some of whose recommendations have been carried out, your Petitioner again submits that his request for an " investigation," and the ascertaining by a practical test the fair value of the class of work he is expected to perform, is not " unreasonable."

That your Petitioner further notes that under the amended regulations relating to the Victorian Land Act, selectors of 320 acres in the rough parts of Victoria are required to pay £25 survey fee, which is nearly double the amount (£13 15s.) for which your Petitioner was required to supply a scientifically accurate survey of the same area in the very roughest part of the Huon district.

That in letters very recently addressed by your Petitioner to the Honorable the Minister of Lands, and to the Deputy Surveyor-General, he has shown that for the past two years—during which, for the sake of his professional reputation, he has been obliged to carry on the work in a much more careful and accurate manner than formerly—he (your Petitioner) has actually only realised from work performed by himself, after paying all costs of his survey party, an income of about *One Hundred Pounds a Year*, and that during these two years, viz.—since the regulations have been in force—he has been obliged (although having plenty to do, and almost constantly at work) to borrow £200 on mortgage of property to cover current family expenses; also that his assistants, who are " Authorised Surveyors," have only been earning the pay of ordinary labourers.

That your Petitioner would also point out that the system of paying for surveys in Tasmania, referred to by Mr. Black as " inadequate " and as " unequal in its application," is, in truth, *monstrously unjust*, inasmuch as your Petitioner can state cases—one or two in particular—in which a Surveyor has been able to earn more money in a few months than your Petitioner could earn in his district in as many years ; also that survey work requiring no

special professional skill, and which could be performed by the merest tyro in the profession, has been under the former scale, and may be still more under the present scale, paid for at rates which will give the lucky Surveyor *double*, sometimes *treble*, the pay which is allowed in Tasmania to a first-class Railway Engineer. The system is not only unjust, but it is "demoralising," because the emoluments of Surveyors, instead of being fixed, as in the case of other officers, by Parliament, are dependent upon the goodwill or otherwise of those in authority; and your Petitioner affirms that the whole of the surveys throughout the Island can be carried out in a properly scientific and accurate manner at a cost to the country not exceeding that at present incurred, by the adoption of a system by which each Surveyor shall receive adequate pay, and *no more*, for the time he is employed; abolishing the anomaly which at present exists of officers of similar grade, and equal in every other respect, working under such different circumstances, as to give them incomes, ranging from *starvation point* to £800 or £900 a year.

Your Petitioner therefore prays—that your Honorable House will institute an enquiry into the truth of his statements, and into the whole system of payment for surveys to which he has referred, and recommend the adoption of a system which shall be more equitable to these intetested, and more advantageous to the public service of the country.

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

APPENDIX B.

Crown Lands Office, October 15th, 1886.

Mining Surveys.

MEMO.

HEREWITH is submitted to the Minister certain correspondence with Mr. George Innes, District Surveyor, in connection with the remuneration paid to surveyors generally, and himself in particular.

You will see that Mr. Innes contends that his district is exceptionally rough, and therefore he should be paid at an exceptional rate. Divested of all unnecessary appendages this is the point at issue. He also, in a milder degree, maintains that surveyors generally are insufficiently paid for the class of work they are now called upon to perform.

Remuneration for Surveys generally.

There is no doubt that surveys are becoming much more difficult and expensive to execute as settlement extends into rougher and more inaccessible country. The rate of wages has increased, and men decline to work such long hours as formerly; moreover the Department has raised the standard of work, and now requires more careful surveys than before; but certainly nothing that can be called "scientific."

When I assumed charge of this Department and began to improve the survey business, I persuaded the Minister to make some concessions in the remuneration given to surveyors, and the Minister therefore consented to abolish the distinction between the rates paid for open lands and heavily-timbered lands, and also the deduction of one-fourth which was previously made when surveys adjoined one another. This concession was of importance to surveyors, though perhaps not so much to Mr. Innes. Considering the amount of toil involved in a surveyor's life, I am of the opinion that the scale of fees is not sufficiently high, and on two occasions I brought this under your notice. Mr. Black recommended that there should be three degrees of payment, but in that recommendation I cannot agree. It would be impossible to determine what lands should come under each charge, and there are exceedingly rough districts in the midst of comparatively open areas; it would inevitably happen that the maximum scale would have to be paid in most cases. Besides, there is the difficulty of providing a fund from which the increased cost would be paid; it is obvious that the selector should not be called upon to do it, and I have repeatedly been told that the General Revenue is not to be looked to for further sums in aid of survey work. Want of money has always been the great stumbling-block in the way of carrying out superior survey operations in Tasmania, and it would be folly to commence a new system unless the Government are prepared to persevere with it at any cost. I am aware that some authorities advocate the adoption of a system of salaried surveyors; but I am firmly of the opinion that the system would entail a much larger expenditure, and would not secure better results than the present.

Mr. Innes's case.

When I came to this office, recognising the fact that Mr. Innes is the oldest Surveyor in the Department, and had for many years worked in a district where settlement progresses but slowly, I offered him the Survey District of Wellington, now the best in Tasmania. He declined, stating that he had an orchard and property at the Huon; which he did not care to give up. I then recommended him to the Engineer-in-Chief for employment on the preliminary railway surveys; so that it is scarcely fair for him to say I have not considered his position. When the Survey Regulations came out, and Mr. Innes objected to them as being too hard on him, I persuaded the Minister to relax them in his case until his work could be compared with that of other surveyors. I was under the impression that he was now content. The Inspector of Surveys examined some of his work, and, as the result was not altogether satisfactory, it was decided to let him go on until the first irritation had gone off, and he had fully learnt what the Department required. It was my intention, during the coming summer, to have a more critical inspection made, and then to personally examine his district, as it is the only one in the Colony I am not well acquainted with.

I am not prepared to admit Mr. Innes's contention that the Huon is so much rougher and more expensive to work in than other parts of Tasmania; and the Inspector of Surveys decidedly demurs to the statement (*vide paper attached*).

Mr. Innes, by his own acknowledgment, has been for many years in the habit of effecting his surveys in the roughest possible manner." He now finds that his old sins are coming to light, and that he experiences great difficulty in fitting his new work on the old. Now that the Department possesses sufficient staff in the office to rigidly test surveyors' plans, several surveyors have been put to much trouble to reconcile discrepancies; but if in the past they had been more careful to return sound work, they would not now be worried with the ghosts of buried sins.

Mr. Innes's contention that the remuneration paid him is at a starvation rate seems illogical in the face of his admission that part of his work is let out to authorised surveyors, who act as his assistants, actually executing the surveys at rates below the contract scale. I am of opinion that he leaves a great deal too much to his assistants.

If he works energetically himself, and yet finds it necessary to employ two assistants, it would imply that if surveyors were paid salaries, two, if not three, would be required for the Huon District alone, where settlement is small in comparison with other districts.

There are several minor points raised by Mr. Innes, but they are not material to the two main points.

CHAS. P. SPRENT, *Deputy Surveyor-General.*

SINCE the above was written, I find Mr. Innes has appealed to Parliament; I therefore recommend that no action be taken at present.

C. P. S.

Franklin, Huon, 29th September, 1886.

SIR,

A FEW days ago I again addressed the Hon. the Minister of Lands on the subject of the survey work in the Huon district, pointing out that no notice whatever had been taken of my very strong representations embodied in a memorial to the Government, in which I showed very plainly that at the prices paid for these surveys I could not do the work in a proper manner and at the same time earn a living.

I cannot but consider that in this matter I have been treated with great injustice, and feeling bound to assume that the Government, in declining to listen to my complaint, are acting upon the advice of the professional head of the Department. I think it desirable that I should also write to you on the subject. In doing so I propose to recapitulate the whole facts of the case, making such remarks as may occur to me while writing.

In April, 1884, I received from you a printed copy of "rules and regulations," with an intimation that these rules were to supersede those previously in force. I immediately replied, pointing out the "injustice" of these regulations as regarded myself, inasmuch as I was required to perform "impossibilities," being expected to supply the Government with a superior and scientifically accurate class of survey in a rough and difficult country at the same price as is given for work where the land is open and no difficulties occur—at a price, moreover, which I contended, and still contend, would not pay for the labour necessary to employ in clearing out the lines: consequently I positively refused to carry out the survey work of the district subject to these regulations.

I afterwards received two letters from yourself, dated 19th September, 1884—the one intimating the decision of the Hon. the Minister, viz., that I might continue to survey as before, but that "an early opportunity will be taken to ascertain what are the special difficulties to be met with in your district," &c.; the other one asking me for certain explanations of my objection to the regulations, which you stated was required by yourself before taking steps to investigate my complaint.

I have now to ask you, two years having elapsed, what steps have been taken towards investigating my complaint, or of ascertaining the reasonableness or otherwise of my positive refusal to conform to the new regulations?

It seems to me that the act of an official deliberately "refusing" to carry out the instructions of the head of his Department requires justification. I was either perfectly right or altogether wrong; in the latter case I have no hesitation in saying that compliance with the regulations should have been insisted upon, under penalty of "instant dismissal."

But, I presume, from my being referred to in your annual report for 1886 as the "one surveyor" who refused to conform to the regulations at present scale of fees, and "has continued to survey in the old style with compass and circumferentor," that you are yourself convinced that my refusal, two years ago, to carry out your instructions was amply justified by the facts of the case, more particularly since the Inspector of Surveys, reporting in the interests of the Government, expresses an opinion that the survey of 100 acres, which I was required by your regulations to effect for £8 15s., was worth about £14 (*vide* your letter to me, October 28th, 1885.)

With reference to the wide difference of opinion between the Inspector and myself as to actual worth of this survey if made in conformity with regulations, I may remark that my estimate included a liberal allowance for bad weather, and I still assert that such a survey made at the time I was working in the locality would have cost, if surveyor was fairly paid for his time, all the money I named (£30); again, I may say, without any imputation upon the Inspector, that "opinions" not based upon practical test are sometimes found to be erroneous. For instance, it was of course the opinion of the Deputy Surveyor-General, based upon considerable experience of what is called "rough country," that surveys of the character required by the regulations could be made in the Huon district at the same rate as in any other part of Tasmania; whereas the "practical experience" of myself and assistant is, that not only is it a positive "impossibility" to conform to the regulations at the present scale of fees, but that it is also "impossible," having in view the high rates of wages and other causes, to perform surveys even fairly well at such rates excepting at a cost to the surveyor, reducing his remuneration to an amount which none but "born idiots" will continue to work for.

But I further desire to call your attention to my letters of September 20th, 1884, in which I "thank the Hon. the Minister of Lands for his favourable consideration of my representations, and for his promise that an early opportunity will be taken, &c.;" also in another letter, "I beg to state that my sole objection to the regulations applies to the question of survey fees, and that I would very much rather perform the work in the more scientific manner required than, as at present, with the compass;" again, "hitherto it (Huon District) has been treated as exceptional by acceptance of an inferior class of work; this I now believe to be a mistake, and that, looking to the future, it will be better to treat it as exceptional only in the matter of payment after the value of the higher class of work has been fairly ascertained."

I beg you will note from this—

- 1st. That I asked for, was promised, and expected an investigation.
- 2nd. That my refusal to conform to the regulations did not arise from any desire to throw obstacles in the way of necessary reforms in the survey system of Tasmania, but simply because—as I have reiterated over and over again—the pay offered is out of all reasonable proportion to the work required to be done, and that I cannot possibly do it in a proper manner for the money.

If the Government wish to place scientific work upon the same basis as brick-laying or stone-breaking, by getting it done at the very lowest figure which will enable the unfortunate surveyor to keep body and soul together, I should recommend them to adopt the Victorian system of letting the work by tender. This would very soon afford a practical solution of the question of the relative values of surveys in open and rough country, as I will guarantee that contracts for the former would be taken at one-half the money required for the latter.

I do not overlook the fact that it may possibly be urged against me that some of my past work is faulty; but it has all been honestly done, and is certainly no worse than that of others working under much more favourable conditions. The errors have arisen from the very cause which I am now fighting against, and which I am determined to fight against, viz., insufficiency of pay.

If you employ surveyors who are obliged to rush the surveys and to trust to others, who may be unskilled or careless, in order to realise a very moderate profit, the natural outcome must be unreliable work. No living man will carry on a scientific operation such as surveying with that carefulness and attention to accuracy which is necessary, if he knows that his very bread depends upon his getting over a certain number of chains per day.

In a former letter (two years ago), I strongly pointed out the inequalities and injustice of the present system of payment for surveys as referred to by Mr. Black, and no one knows better than yourself that such inequalities and injustice do exist.

I will refer, for instance, to the case of surveys performed by yourself when a "District Surveyor" at Heemskirk, on the West Coast. I have before me chart of these surveys, and notice the number of lots to be about 140, nearly all adjoining, and the value, if paid for at present contract rates, some £1100 or £1200. You will hardly contradict me when I say (knowing as I do that for the most part the country in question is bare of timber or scrub) that those surveys could have been performed by the employment of a staff surveyor at £2 2s. per day, and one or more assistants at £1 1s. per day, and all camp expenses paid, for a sum not exceeding £500—meaning a saving to the country of £600.

It would not take many such items to pay all the extra cost for scientific surveys in the roughest and most difficult country; and if the Parliament will investigate the matter, I will prove my statements by indisputable evidence.

I exceedingly regret that I should be forced into this position of antagonism to the head of the Department in which I have been so long employed; I can only say it is none of my seeking, and nothing but a very strong sense of injustice would induce me to write as I have done. Every professional chief but yourself, during my long career—every political head of the Department, with the exception of the present Hon. Minister of Lands—have recognised and sympathised with the exceptional difficulties of my post in having uniformly rough work and comparatively small pay. In all other cases in which I have found it necessary to appeal to the "Executive" I have met with liberal and generous response, and certainly have never before been treated as now, with contemptuous silence.

I have, &c.

G. INNES, *District Surveyor*.

The Deputy Surveyor-General.

Franklin, 23rd September, 1886.

SIR,

SOMEWHAT more than 12 months ago I forwarded a memorial to the Governor-in-Council upon the subject of the fees paid for surveys, pointing out that it was utterly impossible for any surveyor to earn a living in the Huon District at present contract rates, if he attempted to carry on his work with that carefulness and attention to accuracy which—irrespective of the question as to what particular kind of instrument should be used—is by the new regulations certainly demanded of all surveyors, myself not excepted. I have not been favoured with any reply to that memorial, or even with any official notification of its receipt.

I have now to add to what I then stated that during the last year (1885) the value of the work I was able myself to do amounted to a trifle under £300. I find, on reference to my accounts, that I paid away upwards of £85 of this in wages alone, and having as well to provide rations, boat, camp equipage, occasional hotel, travelling, and transport expenses, instruments, tools, drawing materials, appliances, and stationery. I feel quite sure that I am under the mark in estimating the total cost of my survey party at £200, leaving me a net profit for the year, as the result of my own work, of £100.

In order to show the enormous disparity between the amounts which can be earned by surveyors in Tasmania under different circumstances (although I am only repeating former statements), I would observe that when on the West Coast some few years ago I cleared the same amount of £100, notwithstanding very heavy expenses, in six weeks, two out of which were occupied in travelling. Unfortunately my opportunities of thus appreciating the "loaves and fishes" of the profession have been few and far between.

But bad as is my own case, that of my assistant, Mr. E. G. Innes, is worse. As I am responsible for and supposed to overlook his work, I am, of course, obliged to give him less than I myself receive. The total value of the work he did during the year (constantly employed) was £260, but being young, active, and able to carry loads on his back, &c., his camp expenses would in proportion be less than mine. He probably cleared £50 or £60 for the year's work, nearly the pay of a good chainman.

During the past two years, that is, during the period that has elapsed since the passing of the new regulations, I have actually realised from my official position of "District Surveyor" just about £200 short of a bare living.

I observe that the Deputy Surveyor-General in his last report states that one surveyor (meaning, of course, myself), declines to conform to the regulations at present rate of pay: this, I am constrained to say, is not calculated to convey a correct impression as to the real facts of the case.

In the first place, Mr. Coombes, sen., resigned his appointment immediately on issue of the new regulations, knowing, like myself, the impossibility of carrying them out in his District, excepting at great additional cost. Mr. Herbert Coombes, who succeeded him, although he may not have actually refused, as I did, to comply with the regulations, is really working upon exactly the same lines as myself—that is, conforming to the letter of the regulations in all cases in which it can be done at any reasonable cost, and to their spirit, by effecting all surveys in a much more careful and better manner than formerly. I assert, without fear of contradiction, that Mr. Coombes could not in his district comply strictly and in their entirety with the present regulations without positive loss. Mr. Coombes can earn a living working in the manner he does—at present rates—upon just the same principle as my assistants, Messrs. E. G. Innes and J. Stansfield, can earn labourers' pay at the lesser rate I can afford to give them—viz., they are all much younger, and consequently more active than myself, can work (in summer) 12 to 13 hours a day, and can save an extra man and other expenses by doing much of the manual labour, carrying loads, &c. themselves; but I say that it is a shame and a disgrace that a professional man in Tasmania should be obliged to work like a nigger, live like a pig, and carry loads like a donkey, for a miserable subsistence.

I object to be stigmatized as the only surveyor in Tasmania working (it might be imagined, always, and from ignorance or preference) in a manner which, being rightly designated clumsy and unscientific, should only apply to exceptional cases.

I object to be responsible for the surveys of assistants who are expected to be properly qualified, and to work with due regard to scientific accuracy, but to whom I am only able to offer such terms as will afford them the pay of labourers.

I object to resign, because I will not be "starved out" of an appointment which I have held with, I believe, credit to myself, and to the satisfaction of the public, for upwards of 25 years; but I positively refuse, after the end of the current year (up to which time present engagements extend), to carry on the survey work of the district excepting upon such terms as will enable me to do the work properly myself, see that those employed by me also do it properly, and afford them, well as myself, something like fair payment for our services. Failing this, the Government can either "dismiss" me or send someone else to do the work; my feeling being just this—that of two evils, I may just as well be idle and starve as work and starve.

I have, &c.

G. INNES, *District Surveyor.*

The Hon. the Minister of Lands.

Crown Lands Office, Hobart, 2nd October, 1886.

SIR,

I HAVE the honor to return the two letters of Mr. Innes submitted to me by you, bearing dates 23rd and 30th of last month respectively. Your attention is respectfully drawn to the following extract from a similar somewhat intemperate letter of Mr. Innes's, dated the 11th May, 1885, as it discloses a state of things obtaining in this district most prejudicial to the interests of the country, and which proves most conclusively that Mr. Innes, for many long years, has been indulged to an extraordinary extent. I have underlined passages in this extract—"Hitherto the surveys made in this (Huon) District have been effected in the *roughest possible* manner, and with but little regard to strict accuracy. Old surveys have been *assumed* to be correct, and *worked in* with new *without question*, the most *glaring discrepancies passing through 'the office' unnoticed*, so that in very many cases *not more* than one half of the lot under survey has been actually measured"—&c. This is not surveying, and is not much above the art of bricklaying, quoted in Mr. Innes's letter of the 29th September. I have yet to learn that any scientific work has ever now or is likely to be demanded from Mr. Innes in his district. That term is misleading. It appears that he has been generously permitted to go on in the "good old way," the only stipulation being that his lines should be well chained and marked, and all four lines instead of two. "Scientific" work is not expected from district surveyors, but ordinary sectional work, with proper closes with theodolite, and even that is a great deal more than is at present expected from Mr. Innes. However hard his case may be, there are harder ones. Gentlemen who have not had their districts for years, but who have to re-establish and join on to faulty work of others who were there before them, and these gentlemen are making good theodolite surveys, not scientific, but good ordinary work, in quite as rough portions of the Colony. I advocated in my first annual report paid mileage, increased fees or salaries. Some of these gentlemen really deserve consideration, especially when they have submitted with a good grace to the new order of things, as most of them have done, in the hope, no doubt, that by withdrawing factious opposition their own position would be bettered. In the same professional spirit, with every desire to be just, I doubled the price of survey for 100 acres that Mr. Innes quoted; but it is hardly likely that any suggestion or recommendation coming from myself would be acceptable to Mr. Innes. Mr. Innes complains his letters are unacknowledged; they appear to me so intemperate that it is a further mark of favour to have tolerated them. He seems unable to appreciate the favour conceded him, and it is my duty to warn or rather inform the Honorable the Minister and yourself that considerable dissatisfaction already exists amongst the other surveyors that Mr. Innes should have been liberally treated, and if this matter is not summarily dealt with there may be much further trouble. I do not recommend further than this, that Mr. Innes be offered some work in somebody else's district—there is plenty of it—but the work to be done properly according to the regulations, and Mr. Thompson asked if he is willing to try some surveys in Mr. Innes's district. Mr. Innes draws attention to a case where the Deputy is stated to have been paid £1100 as a district surveyor for work done, which work he says could have been done by salaried officials at a saving of £600 to the country: that proves nothing; salaried officers judiciously placed when work is plentiful are cheaper, and I have always maintained it.

I have, &c.

WENTWORTH M. HARDY, *Inspector of Surveys.*

*The Hon. the Minister of Lands,
through the Deputy Surveyor-General, Hobart.*

Crown Lands Office, Hobart, 11th November, 1886.

SIR,

IN obedience to your instructions I have the honor to submit the following information showing the original cost of certain surveys, the cost of my inspection of them, including the pay of self and men. These surveys are situate in the same District, but in three places, a considerable distance apart.

Original Cost of Survey.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Near New Norfolk—						
90 acres. Wm. Pegler	8	15	0			
50 acres. S. Coleman	8	15	0			
Roads in connection, about	6	5	0			
				23	15	0
Beyond the Ouse, above Hamilton—						
233 acres. Geo. Blackwell	12	10	0			
309 acres. H. Blackwell	13	15	0			
Roads, about	13	0	0			
				39	5	0
Near Uxbridge—						
30 acres. J. MacAndrew	5	0	0			
30 acres. W. Grueber	5	0	0			
60 acres. J. T. Thorne	8	15	0			
Roads in addition	2	5	0			
				21	0	0
<i>Approximate Total Cost of Survey</i>			£84	0	0

Results of Inspection.

New Norfolk.—27th, 28th, 29th October, and 2nd November, 1885. Work very inferior in marking, and some distances and one line FALSIFIED.—CONDEMNED.

Near Uxbridge.—One line, the south boundary of MacAndrew's block, had a false distance given, wilfully. Rest of work well chained, but only passably marked.—Survey condemned. 3rd, 4th November.

Beyond the Ouse.—5th, 6th, 7th, 8th November. Portion of this time expended in travelling. The work better done, but one line FALSIFIED.—CONDEMNED.

These painfully flagrant cases were referred to in my Annual Report for this year. The same sort of thing being found also in another Surveyor's work.

Cost of Inspection.		£.	s.	d.
Expenditure		5	1	0
Ditto		23	7	6
Salary of self		12	6	8
Ditto of Assistant		2	10	0
Total Cost of Inspection		£43	5	2

Trusting that the foregoing information will be considered satisfactory,

I have, &c.

WENTWORTH M. HARDY, Inspector of Surveys.

The Honorable the Chairman of Select Committee on Payment of Surveys, House of Assembly.

APPENDIX C.

PERMANENT Survey Scale, Regulation of 17th March, 1885.

Areas.	Graduated Scales of Areas specified.						
	1st Scale.	2nd Scale.	3rd Scale.	4th Scale.	5th Scale.	6th Scale.	7th Scale.
When the area does not exceed—	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.	£ s.
20 acres (min.).....	3 0	3 13	3 19	4 5	4 10	5 8	6 13
40 „	3 10	4 8	4 16	5 5	5 12	7 8	9 3
60 „	3 18	5 0	5 10	6 2	6 16	8 19	11 2
80 „	4 5	5 10	6 2	6 15	7 14	10 5	12 15
100 „	4 11	5 19	6 13	7 7	8 12	11 8	14 4
120 „	4 16	6 7	7 2	7 17	9 7	12 9	15 10
140 „	5 1	6 14	7 10	8 7	10 1	13 8	16 14
160 „	5 6	7 2	7 19	8 17	10 15	14 6	17 17
240 „	6 1	8 5	9 7	10 9	13 1	17 8	21 14
320 „ (max.).....	6 15	9 5	10 10	11 15	15 0	20 0	25 0

APPENDIX D.

WRITTEN Evidence supplied by Mr. R. Hall, Surveyor, River Forth.

- 1. Do you consider the country at the Huon exceptionally rough as compared with the Scottsdale or North-West Coast country? By no means.
- 2. Do you consider the present payment for surveys under the new regulations satisfactory? No.
- 3. Do you consider that a surveyor, by steady work, can make a fair income under the present Survey Regulations? Not if he fully complies with the regulations, unless he works twelve hours a day, and does his calculations afterwards.
- 4. What difference will the compliance with the new regulations make to the income derived from the work? Taking one thing with another, they reduce the income from one to one-half, according to country where work is done.