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Railways, as a form of transport for goods, had been in regular use in England since the early 1800s. The world's first passenger carrying railway operated by steam engines opened on 27 September 1825. From this early beginning the great railway networks of Great Britain grew rapidly. By the 1860s the railway was the cheapest way of moving goods and passengers and suburban lines were being constructed in London, underground.

In Australia, the advantages of the railway were not ignored, culminating in the opening of the Port Melbourne line in Victoria on 12 September 1854 and the Sydney to Parramatta line on 26 September 1855. The Moreton Bay Colonists were advocating a railway or tramroad from Ipswich to the Darling Downs, and in early 1856 a survey party arrived to find a suitable route. Six months later they completed the survey, not of a tramway from Ipswich, but of a railway from Brisbane.¹

Mr. G. R. Ford is a specialist researcher on the history of the Brisbane Tramway network and has previously published in this Journal on other aspects of trams in Brisbane.
Nothing further was done until after Separation, when the Moreton Bay Tramway Company was formed in 1860. This company failed and the Government introduced a bill to authorise construction of a railway from Ipswich to the Darling Downs on 19 May 1863. There was much debate whether the 'coastal' terminus should be Ipswich or Brisbane. The policy of the squatter-dominated Government was to use the rivers wherever possible, with railways confined to replacing the mud tracks of the interior; thus Ipswich was chosen as the terminus. The first section of the line from Ipswich to Bigge's Camp opened on 31 July 1865.

**RAILWAY TO BRISBANE**

A line had already been surveyed to South Brisbane and many citizens and politicians urged its construction. A Royal Commission found in 1871 that a railway between Brisbane and Ipswich would be economically sound, competing with the then current method of transport, riverboats; even if only two thirds of the current cargo was transferred from them to the railway, £12,733 out of £19,600, the railway would still cover its projected operating costs of £13,356 if the traffic increased only marginally. The majority of witnesses however believed that traffic would increase several fold.

The report bore out the arguments put forward in 1865 by Charles Blakeney, member for North Brisbane, when proposing that the railway should at least be surveyed to Brisbane. He referred to the delay in transit accorded by the tides, the slowness of river travel, and the damage to goods accorded by the need to tranship them several times before they reached their ultimate destination. He even advocated the extension of the line to Lytton (Fisherman's Island) to avoid the necessity of having to dredge the river mouth. Other members argued it would be better to deepen the river to Ipswich and the motion was lost 18 to 7. Several other attempts had been made to obtain the railway before the Royal Commission recommended it in 1871.

The next argument concerned the site of the railway terminus, and the route the railway would take. The Royal Commission had examined two routes, one surveyed by Fitzgibbon, following the river, and the other surveyed by Thorneloe-Smith which was further inland and cheaper but crossed the Oxley Creek flood plains. These surveys had been carried out in 1866 and 1868, following the receipt of several petitions. Added to the debate was the choice of gauge and strength of construction. Following the financial crisis of 1866, the Colony's finances had not fully recovered and this, together with the requests for more lines to be built, led to the sitting of a Royal Commission on 31 January, 1872 to inquire into the best methods of building cheaper railways. Narrower gauges, no ballast, lighter rolling
stock, and tramroads were all suggested as ways of increasing the length of track built. One definite proposal recommended, however, was the immediate construction of the line to Brisbane on three feet six inch gauge. Everyone involved in the debate accepted Brisbane as the final destination, but there was no agreement on the route, nor the site of the terminal station. Four main routes emerged: one advocated by the Minister for Works, Macalister, crossing the Brisbane River near its junction with the Bremer River running via Moggill to a station in North Brisbane; another advocated by the railway Engineer-in-Chief, Stanley, who believed the line should cross the River at Oxley Point; and the two routes previously mentioned which involved a terminal station on the south side of the River in Stanley Street. No site had yet been suggested for a station in North Brisbane.

Parliament resolved that a line be built from Ipswich to Oxley, the point at which the three main contending routes diverged, the Moggill route having been dismissed because although the shortest it involved crossing the hilly country in the Moggill region. The plans were approved on 15 August, 1872. At this stage the South Brisbane routes were preferred as they took the railway to the wharves, the main reason for the line's construction. Two main proposals were put forward in 1872. The first was the building of a station at the southern end of Victoria Bridge, and the other involved continuation of the line along Stanley Street and across the Victoria Bridge (or a new bridge beside it) to a station site either behind the Treasury Building in what is now Queen's Park, or at the Waterholes (City Hall site), or on the present site of Roma Street Station. Stanley objected to the station at South Brisbane because it was below flood level. To put it above flood level would require extensive earthworks which would make access to the wharves difficult. If it were placed closer to Woolloongabba, there would be little room for sidings. His objections to the crossing of the bridge were numerous. The curves would have to be very sharp (5 chain radius); many city buildings would have to be removed in the most expensive section of the city; level crossings would be required over several major city streets, including Queen, George, and Adelaide Streets if the line went to the only suitable station site, namely that at Roma Street; the passage of trains would delay city traffic, and river traffic since the bridge was an opening bridge. Stanley recommended his own route coming via Oxley Point. Examined at the Bar of the Council on 21 August, 1872, John Jones, the contractor for the Victoria Bridge, said that it would only cost about £7000 to take the line over Victoria Bridge if it were done while under construction, compared with an estimated £50,000 for a separate bridge either at Oxley or in the city area. In reply to a question from Mr King, Stanley stated that although his proposal did
not connect the railways to the wharves, this might easily be accomplished by the construction of tramways down the centre of the street to the wharves from Roma Street.\textsuperscript{14}

**STANLEY’S ROUTE CONSTRUCTED**

The whole matter was finally resolved in Stanley’s Report of 23 May 1873 which showed that the line to North Brisbane by Oxley Point had fewer sharp curves, fewer inclines and although 13 chains 33 links longer, cost £134,201/8/- compared to £139,842/2/6d, a saving of £5,640/14/6d. The costs of resuming the valuable riverfront areas of South Brisbane more than offset the cost of constructing the large bridge necessary at Oxley Point to cross the Brisbane River. On the question of the necessary access to the wharves, Stanley again said:

\begin{quote}
The proposed site of the terminal station in North Brisbane is, I consider, a very much better one. It lies high, is conveniently situated, being only a short distance from the business part of the city, and has ample space for an advantageous arrangement of station buildings, sidings, &c. The only draw back to it, in comparison to the position on the south side, is the want of ready access to wharf accommodation; but this objection might, I think in a great measure be remedied by laying suitable tramways from
\end{quote}
it to the various wharves, so that the trucks might be conveyed by horse traction, and unloaded or loaded, as the case might be, alongside the shipping. Very great improvements have of late years been effected in the manner of constructing street tramways and they are now used in most of the principal seaport towns in England, showing that their employment cannot be any serious obstacle to street traffic.¹⁵

Following this report, Parliament recommended the adoption of the North Brisbane Route on 10 June, 1873. The line from Ipswich to Oxley Point opened on 4 February 1875 and the line from Brisbane to Indooroopilly on 14 June, 1875.¹⁶ The line across the bridge was not opened until 5 July, 1876, when it was at last possible to travel from Ipswich to Brisbane without interruption.

**THE NEED FOR TRAMWAYS**

Street tramways date back to one opened in New Orleans on 23 April, 1831 and a true tramway in New York on 26 November 1832. It was 1860 before the first street lines were opened in Great Britain in Birkenhead and London, in March 1861.¹⁷ Sydney opened its first tramway on 23 December, 1861, but like the early English ones, it too had its rails set above street level and like them, was soon abandoned.¹⁸ The Sydney line, like ones later proposed in Brisbane, was to take passengers from the railway terminus into the city proper.

Street tramways were received with some suspicion in Australia following the Sydney failure. It was not until the first Adelaide lines were opened on 10 June, 1878, that a horse drawn street tramway existed in the colonies.¹⁹ Sydney opened a temporary steam tramway along Elizabeth Street in September 1879 to carry patrons to the Colonial Exhibition.²⁰ The line soon became permanent and the large Sydney system grew from it. Thus the street tramway was a relative new comer to the colonies when the methods of taking the Southern and Western Railway to deep water were being debated in Brisbane.

Almost from the opening of the station at Roma Street, the public realised it was in the wrong locality, necessitating the use of private contractors to get goods to their final destinations. Even before the line opened, the matter of getting coal supplies to the wharves had been considered by the Railway Department. Produce had to go to merchant’s warehouses before it was shipped, so there was no great advantage in taking the railways to the wharves except to bunker ships and to export coal to the northern ports. Several locations were proposed, but street tramways were not suggested because of the large quantity of traffic that would be generated.

**RIVAL ROUTES FOR COAL**

The first site examined was near Toowong which was surveyed in early 1875. Two elevated shoots of 100 tons and one of 60 tons were
An imaginative sketch of a railway terminus at Petrie Bight; unfortunately there was no room to locate such an impressive station
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proposed, their height avoiding the necessity to construct lifts to raise the coal, as would have been the case if either of the two Queen's Wharf sites (as surveyed in 1875) were chosen. In addition, there was only a small section of the river bank near Queen's Wharf which had sufficient deep water to permit large vessels to come alongside to coal, unless the wharf was built well out into the river, partially blocking the channel. The Toowong line was estimated to cost £8,083/14/- and the Queen's Wharf short line £18,278/18/4d. The Oxley suggestion was made by the Archibald brothers, operators of the Eastwood Colliery who were prepared to lay a tramway to their mine from the railway if the Government built them a loading facility at Oxley Point. Although they estimated the cost at a few hundred pounds, their plan was rejected because it would give them a monopoly, and the site was considered not suitable for a coaling wharf. A line to Bulimba was surveyed by 16 August, 1875 and was estimated to cost £34,654/3/7d. Stanley, who took over again as Engineer-in-Chief of the Southern and Western Railway from Thomeloe-Smith, reported on this line on 4 March, 1876. He was most impressed with the suitability of the area just above the Bulimba Ferry for high level coal shoots as deep water was available for large ships. In his report to the Minister for Works on 30 April, 1877, Stanley again recommended the Bulimba branch with stations for passenger traffic and an extension of the line to Creek Street around Observatory Hill. He ruled out both Toowong and Oxley because of their limited facilities and Queen's Wharf, because there was insufficient space for sidings. The Minister and Commissioner for Railways both appeared to support the Queen's Wharf route and Stanley was instructed firstly to survey an extension as far as the Domain and finally a route around to the new wharves to be constructed at Petrie's Bight following the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Wharfage.

In the *Courier* of 9 March 1875 the writer "T.D." suggested the construction of street tramways to the wharves, because of the inconvenience of transferring goods and passengers to the city and wharves. He proposed the untried and impracticable spring propulsion system and his proposal was ignored. Other proposals in 1876 required the construction of horse drawn street tramways but nothing eventuated. The *Courier* on 26 September, 1877, suggested that the Merryweather design of steam tram operating in Paris might be suitable for the extension of the railway to the wharves using the streets. Most serious suggestions at this time involved railway extension. Proposals were being received for the extension of the railway to Sandgate and it was hoped that this extension might be incorporated with the Bulimba Line.
ANOTHER ROYAL COMMISSION

Two petitions received in July 1877 called for the extension of the railway to Petrie's Bight via Observatory Hill. The first was signed by 76 businessmen and the latter by 494 citizens. Both petitions referred to the inconvenience of the existing railway terminus. Finally, on 7 February, 1878, a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the best method of extending the railway to the wharves. It sat from the 11 February, 1878 until the 19 March, 1878 and heard evidence from twenty-one witnesses. The commission examined the Bulimba Line; the Queen's Wharf Line to Petrie's Bight via two routes; the Observatory Hill route to Petrie's Bight; a tramway down Roma, Albert, Mary and Alice Streets; and the original South Brisbane proposal plus a variation taking the line to River Terrace Kangaroo Point. Railway Commissioner Herbert preferred the Queen's Wharf route as it would serve all the north Brisbane wharves with both general cargo and coal. Stanley, although expressing some support for the Queen's Wharf lines to Petrie Bight, still favoured his Bulimba plan along with the street tramways, worked by Merryweather steam engines. With the building of extensive wharves at Bulimba for coaling and cargo, and the extension of the Bulimba line via Hamilton to Sandgate, he expected a large suburban passenger traffic to be carried into the heart of the city by tramway. Although the water was deeper at Kangaroo Point, he maintained Bulimba could easily be dredged.
William Nisbet, Engineer-in-Chief of Harbours and Rivers doubted the success of steam trams operating in the streets even though he had no personal experience of any form of tramway. John Sinclair proposed a railway down Albert Street, running more or less as a tramway and stating that such practice was quite common in the United States. Most of the other witnesses were concerned with the extent and quality of the coal for shipping and whether building a railway to the wharves was justified but all favoured some form of connection. On 12 March Stanley was recalled and, excluding land and rolling stock, he estimated each scheme's cost as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Proposed Scheme</th>
<th>Estimate in Pounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Oxley to River Terrace</td>
<td>85,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Woolloongabba to Victoria Bridge</td>
<td>27,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Extension to Bulimba, High-level line to Coal shoots</td>
<td>49,377*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Extension to Bulimba, Low-level line for Wharf</td>
<td>9,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Extension to the Queen's Wharf</td>
<td>24,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Queen's Wharf to Port Office</td>
<td>39,758*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Port Office to Creek Street</td>
<td>14,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Creek Street to Terminus</td>
<td>34,767*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Queen's Wharf through Botanical Gardens</td>
<td>5,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Tramways – Terminus to Port Office</td>
<td>5,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Tramways – Terminus to Petrie's Bight, via Albert, Mary and Eagle Streets</td>
<td>7,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*including cost of tunnelling

Stanley was also questioned about stopping the South Brisbane line at Woolloongabba and running a tramway down Stanley Street. This, he said, would only be suitable for passengers which was somewhat of a contradiction to his other evidence favouring tramways in the city area for goods and passengers. Many witnesses pointed out that the river was one big dock and that the wharves therefore should be placed as near to the City as possible. Harden said that wharves on the south bank from Victoria Bridge to Kangaroo Point would provide for the needs of Brisbane for at least twenty years, and a line from Oxley would provide for a large suburban passenger traffic as well.

Perhaps the most interesting witness however, was Angus Mackay, who had been the Queensland Commissioner to the 1877 Philadelphia Exposition, and therefore had the most recent experience of developments in the World. He favoured the construction of street tramways. Before he departed he was asked by the then Minister of Works, Macalister, to investigate the question while travelling overseas. Mackay advocated connecting all points in the city area with the terminal station and the wharves, using tramways operating
the Merryweather type engine. He said that steam trams were easier to stop than horse trams and therefore safer. He envisaged a goods station at the wharves and near the gaol (Countess Street) but favoured a loop line rather than double track.31

SOUTH BRISBANE SELECTED FOR COAL

During the sitting of the Commission, another proposal was published in the Courier by a Mr. Griffiths, who turned out to be a subordinate of Stanley who had released a rejected plan of Stanley’s. This called for the railway to be extended through the city via Observatory Hill to the Valley and thence Bulimba, with a short branch to Petrie’s Bight. It was estimated to cost £87,469. Interest was lost in this plan when the Courier revealed its true source. This line is of interest however, because the route proposed appeared to suit all needs, including those of the passengers who wanted to enter the City. Stanley had rejected it because it cut through so much of the inner city area, and crossed so many streets.32

The Royal Commission presented its findings on 10 April 1878:

1. That the ordinary export and import trade is fairly provided for.
2. That there is an extensive coal field in West Moreton and on the Darling Downs traversed by the Southern and Western Railway.
3. That the production of coal for home consumption and for export is increasing, and that it would be much more increased if additional facilities for carriage and shipment were provided.
4. That any one of the schemes which have been brought under our notice, with the exception of the proposed tramway extension along Roma street and Albert street, would suffice for such a purpose at the present time.

This gave the Government no guidance as to which scheme to choose. Two minority reports were more specific. Simon Fraser rejected both the Queen’s Wharf and Bulimba schemes while F. Beattie rejected the Queen’s Wharf scheme as a temporary expedient and supported Stanley’s Bulimba scheme. Upon further investigation the Government began to favour the South Brisbane line from Oxley. This was the shortest route for coal and had prospects of a good suburban traffic developing.

The need to resume properties in Stanley Street was the main objection to this line and to surmount this, it was eventually decided to position the station near Vulture Street, avoiding the need to resume prime waterfront warehouses to provide for a station. To enable the South Brisbane Line to use public roads, saving resumption costs, the Railway and Tramway Extensions Act, 1880 was passed in October,
1880. It was planned that the line would follow Fairfield and Ipswich Roads, and Stanley Street. This proposal drew immediate objections from the population who objected to having to share Stanley Street with heavy trains. Fear was expressed that many persons would be killed by the trains each day. Fraser led a deputation to the Minister for Works, Macrossan, asking for the line to go into the water reserve and by tunnel to the wharves. The plan was eventually changed to that suggested by the deputation. It was thus fortunate that the line had not been approved, when submitted to Parliament with the Sandgate line on 20 October, 1880, because of a belief by the Legislative Council that it would not pay its way. The Sandgate line, mentioned during the Royal Commission, was approved, but via Normanby and Albion. The South Brisbane line was finally approved on 11 October 1881 and opened to Stanley Street on 2 June 1884.

**PASSENGER TRAMWAY PROPOSALS**

This did not solve the problem for passengers however who still had to walk from Vulture Street or Roma Street. Many proposals were advanced from 1879 onwards, including one by the Government itself. Two of the 1876 proposals were revived. The *Courier* ran an article on the new Sydney and Adelaide tramways and concluded that it was time that Brisbane had similar transport.

Two proposals were submitted to the Brisbane Municipal Council in December, 1879. The first on December 17, was from Angus Mackay and G.H. Royce on behalf of the Brisbane Tramway Company also known as the Brisbane Tramway and Railway Co., and called for the construction of horse tramways from Woolloongabba to Fortitude Valley, with branch lines to Roma Street Station and the new Creek Street Wharves. It was supported by the *Courier*. The other scheme on 23 December, was received from R.R. Davenbam and J.C. Wylie, representatives of a Sydney based company, who planned a steam operated passenger and goods tramway, operating along a similar route. These proposals sparked a great deal of debate whether tramways or railways should be laid in the streets, or indeed whether either were really needed. Alderman Bale considered the second proposal amounted to a railway, and would therefore interfere with traffic, since it was planned to run trains of a sort on it. Alderman Pettigrew suggested the use of stationary steam engines and cable haulage and most aldermen agreed that the Council needed time to consider the proposals. Reports on tramways in other parts of Australasia were tabled. The Council favoured the proposals in principle, but since they involved giving a company the monopoly of use of portion of the street, it was reluctant to become further involved at that stage. Angus Mackay noted that the proposed tramways were more expensive than those in Glasgow and London and would cost around £23,000, which was a large sum for a private company to raise in the colony. He was obviously hin-
ting that they should be Government or Municipal developments, stating that if it were left to private enterprise, they would be a long way off.\textsuperscript{40} Angus Mackay publicly attacked the promoters of the other scheme, saying they were merely following his lead, and had never been heard of prior to his proposal.\textsuperscript{41} Apart from fear that the use of steam in the streets would frighten horses, nothing further was heard of these proposals to construct tramways. As well, the Council was of the opinion that it did not have the power to authorise construction of the said tramways. Samuel Griffith in his opinion disagreed but added the view, that the Council would not be able to protect them from being indicted as a nuisance.

Another tramway was proposed in early 1881 by the Brisbane and Suburban Tramways Company, under the chairmanship of Hon. J.M. Thompson, M.L.A. and involving Angus Mackay and many other leading citizens. This called for construction of a line from Woolloongabba to Fortitude Valley at a cost of £15,000, and envisaged a ridership of 11,000 per day, based on a traffic count at the Custom’s House. Similar branch lines and light railways were proposed as in previous schemes.\textsuperscript{42} A public meeting called on 25 February to discuss tramways generally agreed that tramways had proved a boon to the cities that had them and had increased trade to the shops along the streets where they were laid.\textsuperscript{43}

**CONSTRUCTION BY PRIVATE COMPANY**

The Council declined to exercise its power to give a monopoly to the proposed Company, despite the many requests and support from the public. The Company then asked the Council to promote a Bill in Parliament to sanction the construction of the tramway.\textsuperscript{44} It appears that the Council objections were influenced by the omnibus proprietors’ lobby, and by the fear that it would lose considerable revenue in the form of omnibus licence fees. On 15 March it was announced that the Council and the nearby Divisional Boards would make a joint approach to the Government for a Tramways Bill.\textsuperscript{45} To the dismay of the many members of Parliament, Aldermen and business people involved with the tramway company, the Government presented a proposal to parliament on 15 September 1881 for a Government owned and operated tramway along Ann Street to Petrie’s Bight. The line was to be steam operated and for passengers only. Much opposition was expressed as the line did not go into the city proper, but simply skirted it but the Post Master General, Morehead, hoped that this was only the start of a larger tramway, and outlined plans for future lines. One of the main opponents was Samuel Griffiths, who saw the lines as a waste of Government monies.\textsuperscript{46} The tramway was agreed to and three Kitson engines and six trailers from Hudson Brothers were ordered in December 1881. Despite some
preliminary trackwork in the railway yards no other work had been commenced when the motors arrived on 2 June, 1883.47

Meanwhile several businessmen and members of cabinet, including the Premier, Sir Thomas McIlwraith, formed the Metropolitan Land, Investment and Building Association, which was registered on 1 September, 1882. They decided that tramways would be beneficial to the areas where they held land and so promoted a bill in Parliament for their construction. This was proclaimed on 3 October, 1882 as the Tramways Act of 1882. On 31 October, 1883 the Company was restructured to form the Metropolitan Tramway and Investment Company and plans were presented to Parliament for the construction of tramways costing £43,031/2/6d.48 The first stage from North Quay to the Exhibition and Newstead opened for public traffic on 12 August, 1885.49 The Tramway was not extended to Woolloongabba until May 1886 when Brisbane at last had one station connected to the city proper.50 Even though there had been agitation for the railway to be extended from Roma Street into the city proper, no tramway connection was provided. By July 1883 all intentions of opening the Ann Street Tramway were ended and the railways tried using the motors and cars in normal traffic.51
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Thus by 1885 the debate over tramways and railways had been finally settled, and it was realised that each had its own role and its own place within the infrastructure of Brisbane. It was now generally accepted that the railways would be left to the longer interurban runs and the tramways to the more densely settled inner city area. No new railways were therefore planned or built into the City area with two exceptions. The terminus at Vulture Street had proved unworkable so a deviation was built to a new high level station at Melbourne Street, in much the same area as the originally proposed South Brisbane Station, opening on 2 December, 1891. A line partly underground to avoid resuming property, was built from Roma Street to Mayne via Fortitude Valley, opening on 1 November, 1890. Railway lines were built to Beenleigh in 1885, to Caboolture in 1888, Cleveland in 1889 and Pinkenba in 1897. A line finally reached the Bulimba Wharves on 16 December, 1897. The short Enoggera branch was opened in 1899, and extended to Dayboro in 1920. Tramways were proposed for the more hilly areas of Brisbane in the late 1880s, serving the western suburbs of Ithaca, Red Hill, Paddington and Kelvin Grove, but it was to be a decade before they were built. This was done by a restructured Metropolitan Tramway and Investment Company, the Brisbane Tramway Company.

In a period of twenty years, from the time of the opening of the first railway the method of bringing produce and passengers to the heart of the capital had been debated. It was not to be possible for all rail passengers to enter the city direct by train until the opening of the
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Merivale Bridge in November, 1978, by which time the connecting trams had been gone for about ten years, replaced by modern diesel omnibuses.

Thus, although the tram was seen as the best solution for getting passengers from the Southern and Western Railway into the city in the 1880's the railway has finally triumphed. After a debate, carried on for over a century, the proponents of a railway into North Brisbane via South Brisbane were finally victorious. As well, Charles Blakeney' 1865 suggestion for wharves at the river mouth was fulfilled in 1980 with the opening of the Railway to Fisherman Islands. The tramways have gone and with them, the missed opportunities for a passenger loop line around the inner city.
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