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Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith:


Greeting:

Whereas it has been deemed expedient that a Commission should forthwith issue to consider and report upon the desirability or otherwise of removing from its present site the Railway Station at Spencer-street, with the view of enabling the City of Melbourne, in our Colony of Victoria, to be extended westward; also, assuming that the present station site is to be adhered to, to consider and report on the best means to connect the City aforesaid with the proposed docks to be constructed on land known as the West Melbourne Swamp: Now know ye that we, reposing great trust and confidence in your zeal, integrity, knowledge, and ability, have constituted and appointed and by these presents do constitute and appoint you the said Albert Lee Tucker, Frederick Thomas Sargood, William Robertson, Nathaniel Thornley, John Ashton Wallace, Robert Burrowes, Walter Madden, William Anderson, George Selth Coppin, David Mortimer Davies, John Laurens, James Henry Wheeler, Peter Wright, William Cain, Clement Hodgkinson, Alexander John Skene, and James Cooper Stewart to be our Commissioners for the purpose aforesaid: And for the better effecting the purposes of this our Commission we do by these presents give and grant unto you, or any five or more of you, in case you shall think fit so to do, full power and authority to call before you such persons as you shall judge likely to afford you any information on the subject of this our Commission: And we do by these presents will and ordain that this our Commission shall continue in full force and virtue, and that you our said Commissioners, or any five or more of you, may proceed in the execution thereof and of every matter and thing therein contained, although your proceedings be not continued from time to time by adjournment: And our further will and pleasure is that you do, with as little delay as possible, report to us under your hands and seals your opinion on the matter herein submitted for your consideration: And we appoint you the said Albert Lee Tucker to be Chairman of this our Commission, with authority to give a second or casting vote at any meeting at which the votes (including that of the Chairman) on any question pertaining thereto shall be equal: And for your assistance in the execution of this our Commission we have made choice of our trusty and well-beloved Arthur William Vines, Esquire, to be Secretary to this our Commission, and to attend you; and his services we require you to use as occasion may require. In testimony whereof we have caused these our letters to be made patent and the seal of our Colony of Victoria to be hereunto affixed.

Witness our trusty and well-beloved Sir Henry Brougham Loch, Knight Commander of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over our Colony of Victoria and its Dependencies, &c., &c., &c., at Melbourne, in our said Colony, this eighteenth day of January, One thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven, and in the fifth year of our reign.

HENRY B. LOCH.

By His Excellency's Command,
D. GILLIES,
Premier.
REPORT.

To His Excellency Sir Henry Brougham Loch, Knight Commander of the Most Honorable Order of the Bath, Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Colony of Victoria and its Dependencies, &c., &c., &c.

May it please Your Excellency—

Your Commissioners, appointed on 18th January last to consider and report upon the desirability or otherwise of removing from its present site the Railway Station at Spencer-street, with the view of enabling the City of Melbourne to be extended westward; also, assuming that the present station site is adhered to, to consider and report on the best means to connect the city with the proposed docks to be constructed on land known as the West Melbourne Swamp, have the honour to report as follows:—

1. Your Commissioners have fully recognised the great importance of the subjects submitted for their consideration and report. The desirability of extending, as far as practicable, the area available in the metropolis for commercial purposes must be admitted on all sides. Such an extension is intimately connected, not only with the import and export trade of the colony, but also with the further development of its local industries and manufactures.

Your Commissioners had to consider—

1st. What advantages might be expected to accrue from the extension westward of some of the principal business thoroughfares.

2nd. How such extension, if it involved the reduction of the Spencer-street Station ground, and the removal of the station, would affect the railway requirements of that terminus.

3rd. In what manner such extension would affect the interests of the general community.

2. Your Commissioners have held fifteen meetings, and examined twenty-seven witnesses. The various interests involved were fully represented—

The Railway Department, by the Railways Commissioners and their officers;

The Harbour Trust, by some of its members, as also its Engineer and Harbour-Master;

The City Corporation, by members thereof, including the Right Worshipful the Mayor, who is also one of your Commissioners, and the Town Clerk and City Surveyor;

The municipalities of South Melbourne and Port Melbourne expressed their views in regard to the proposed removal of the Spencer-street Station through their officers;
Merchants and carriers, who have had transactions with the Railway Department over a very lengthened period, and who have an intimate knowledge of the city and its development, also gave evidence, which was supplemented by that of civil engineers and others; some of whom produced plans or sketches showing what they thought the best means of effecting an extension of the City of Melbourne westward. The Melbourne Chamber of Commerce were invited to tender evidence before your Commissioners, but their Committee replied—"That they have no desire to tender any evidence to the Commissioners on the subject of the extension of the city westward."

The whole of the evidence brought forward, and the various plans and suggestions submitted for consideration, have received the careful attention of your Commissioners.

3. Your Commissioners find that the land in the vicinity of the Spencer-street Railway terminus reserved for railway purposes, as shown on plan "A," contains an area of 429 acres; of this area, 180 acres were added so recently as the year 1886 by the Department of Crown Lands and Survey, at the request of the Railways Commissioners. The following table shows the various reservations of the separate portions of this land:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act, 1853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Area originally taken by the Melbourne, Mt. Alexander, and Murray River Railway Company</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act, 1880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Area taken for Coburg line</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazette, 1862-1886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Areas temporarily reserved at various dates</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Areas departmentally reserved at various dates</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazette 1880, and 1886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Areas permanently reserved</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... Area applied for and not yet formally reserved</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—See The Victorian Railways Commissioners Act 1883, sections 40 and 41, vesting railway lands in the said Commissioners.

The land now vested in the Melbourne Harbour Trust, on the northern side of the River Yarra, for dock purposes, originally permanently reserved for railway purposes (in 1886), comprises 213 acres. The remaining land, lying to the north-west of the dock site, at present unalienated from the Crown, has an area of 630 acres. These three areas, which are shown on plan "A" attached to this report, contain therefore, in the aggregate, 1,272 acres, and form what is known as the West Melbourne Swamp, excepting a small portion of the high ground to the east, occupied for railway purposes.

4. In order to carry out the proposition made by some witnesses, to extend the city of Melbourne westward by continuing Flinders-street, Little Flinders-street, Collins-street, Little Collins-street, and Bourke-street across the present station grounds, the Railway Reserve would have to be curtailed by 65 acres. But it has been shown that, if this land were taken from the Railway Department, a corresponding area consisting of rateable property would have to be acquired further north, and the present Railway Station moved north of the continuation of Bourke-street, across the Railway Reserve and Swamp. This would involve the closing of the streets shown on plan "B" attached. From the junction of Collins-street with Spencer-street, to the Metropolitan Gas Works, upon which Collins-street would abut if carried through in a direct line, is a distance of about 26 1/2 chains, and the steepest gradient would be 1 in 20. Bourke-street, if similarly extended, would be about the same length, and involve a similar gradient. These gradients are governed by the position of the viaduct authorized by Act 821 and the levels of the land. It was, however, shown by some of the witnesses that, if the viaduct were placed some distance further to the west of Spencer-street than is provided in the Act, easier grades could be procured; but other evidence pointed to the inadvisability of such a course.
5. A considerable number of witnesses stated that gradients of 1 in 20 would be so unfavorable to the carriage of heavy goods as to practically preclude their being used for such traffic.

6. Other proposals involved the extension of Lonsdale and Latrobe streets in addition to the streets before mentioned, the gradient necessary in the case of the extension of Lonsdale-street being 1 in 20 and in the case of Latrobe-street 1 in 30. These streets, unlike Bourke and Collins streets, would, if extended in direct lines about upon the site shown on the approved design for future dock extension.

7. If Bourke-street were extended as proposed, and the Spencer-street Station moved to the north of it, the area of land available for building and street purposes would be 65 acres. It was stated by the Railway valuer that, in his opinion, this land would realize about two and a half millions sterling if divided into suitable allotments and sold by public auction; whilst the high land to the north of the present station ground, which would be required to place the Railway Department in the same position as regards available area for railway purposes, was also valued at about half a million sterling. It would, therefore, appear from his evidence that the net sum of two millions sterling might be obtained from the sale of that part of the Spencer-street Railway Reserve lying south of the northern alignment of an extension of Bourke-street. But from this sum the cost of removing the railway buildings, altering lines, and reinstating them in their new positions, and of providing accommodation equal to that now existing at Spencer-street Station, and perhaps on an improved design, has to be deducted. The cost of moving the station north of Bourke-street is estimated by the railway officers at £1,061,278; and the cost of moving it north of Collins-street, so as to allow of the land south of that street to be excised from the station ground and rendered available for sale, is estimated at £741,147. The cost of cutting down the high land before mentioned to a suitable level is included in these estimates. No allowance has been made for the value of the spoil, as the officers of the Railway Department are doubtful when it could be utilised for filling purposes; it cannot therefore be considered as an immediate factor in the cost of moving the Station to the north of Collins-street or of Bourke-street respectively, as proposed, but its value is estimated at £60,750 in the former case, and £121,500 in the latter.

8. The financial results, therefore, appear to be as under:—

If the station be moved to the northern side of the proposed Bourke-street extension:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated amount to be received from the sale of land</th>
<th>£2,500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of purchasing land before referred to, east of Railway Reserve</td>
<td>£500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of moving station, &amp;c.</td>
<td>1,061,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,561,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net result</td>
<td>£938,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the station be moved to the northern side of the proposed Collins-street extension:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated amount to be received from the sale of land</th>
<th>£1,318,450</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of purchasing area of land equal to that excised from present Railway Reserve</td>
<td>£850,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of moving station, &amp;c.</td>
<td>741,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,091,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net result</td>
<td>£226,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Flinders-street, extending from Spring-street to Spencer-street, is now practically the only roadway used to the wharves and to the site of the proposed docks. Its width between those points is nowhere less than 99 feet. From its junction at Spencer-street there is a road, running westward, about 44\frac{1}{2} feet in width,
which is bounded on the north by the Railway Reserve. There is, in addition, a road of irregular width, averaging about 55½ feet, running on the western side of a small dock, and parallel to the wharf, skirting the river. These two roadways bound a triangular piece of land, now occupied as coal sites, and join each other about 12 chains east of the Gas Works. Owing to the insufficient width of road-way in this locality, serious blocks, delaying the traffic, are of every-day occurrence. Besides the two roadways just referred to, an unformed road one-chain wide runs nearly at right angles to the River Yarra, and forms the eastern boundary of the land occupied by the Metropolitan Gas Company.

10. The weight of evidence given before your Commissioners is greatly in favour of maintaining the present Railway Reserve intact. It was pointed out, with much force, that the position of the Spencer-street terminus is a central one, and it was urged that if the passenger and goods stations were placed further back, such a course would be inconvenient to the general public, unfavorable to the producing interests of the country, and directly opposed to the policy adopted in important Railway systems in other parts of the world, where the constant endeavour is to extend railways further into the centres of population. The cost of carriage of goods, always an important item, would also be increased. It was contended that the money obtainable by the sale of this Reserve, as well as the local benefits arising from an extension of the City of Melbourne westward, would not counterbalance the grave disadvantages that would follow the alienation of so valuable a public property, and its future disuse for railway purposes. Some witnesses, however, maintained that the Spencer-street Station could be moved without any inconvenience to the public, and access secured to the docks by the extension of Collins, Bourke, and other streets. They were also of opinion that there would be no material increase, if any, in the cost of the carriage of goods. The evidence of the Right Worshipful the Mayor of Melbourne, of the Town Clerk, and of other witnesses representing the City Corporation, strongly supported this view.

11. A protest against the proposed change was lodged by the municipal councils of South Melbourne and Port Melbourne, urging that the removal of the goods and passenger stations further west would entail an enhanced charge for carriage, and be otherwise inconvenient to the residents of the southern suburbs.

12. It was shown that some of the goods sheds would have to be removed further north-west if the proposed change were adopted.

13. During the inquiry, special reference was made to the relief that has been afforded to the traffic in Flinders-street by the steam ferry at the foot of Spencer-street, and it was stated that an additional steam ferry across the river further west would not only materially lessen the cost of carrying goods to and from the south bank of the Yarra, but would also greatly relieve the traffic along Flinders-street.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

14. Your Commissioners, after carefully considering all the evidence brought before them, respectfully recommend—

(1.) That the present site of the Railway Station at Spencer-street be adhered to, and that all the land reserved in that locality for the Railway Department be retained for railway purposes, except such portions as will be required for the proposed widening and extension of Flinders-street, and for the new street hereinafter recommended as an approach to the docks.

(2.) That as "the best means of connecting the city with the proposed docks to be constructed on land known as the West Melbourne Swamp," the undermentioned streets be improved and extended in the following manner:
Flinders-street, from the swinging basin near the Falls Bridge, to have its northern alignment produced across the southern portion of the Railway Reserve, excluding therefrom an area of about 6 acres, and to have a width of 3 chains available for vehicular and foot traffic from the swinging basin to its junction with Spencer-street, and from this point to be continued, with the same width, along the margin of the River Yarra to its junction with the Saltwater River crossing the dock entrance by means of a bridge.

(3.) That, in addition to the widening and extension of Flinders-street, a new street, not less than one chain and a half in width, be made at a point starting from about 14 chains west from the corner of Spencer-street and Flinders-street, curving from Flinders-street as improved, to the north-east corner of the Metropolitan Gasworks.

(4.) That La Trobe-street be extended by means of a viaduct over the present Railway Reserve to the site of the proposed docks.

(5.) That Dudley-street, which extends to a point on the River Yarra nearly opposite its junction with the New Cut, be improved and rendered available for access to the River, the Docks, the Railway Reserve, and the West Melbourne Swamp, and be proclaimed 2 chains wide from the Railway culvert to the Yarra.

(6.) That an additional steam ferry be provided in the neighbourhood of the western swinging basin.

(See Plan "C," showing proposed street improvements, &c.)

15. In submitting these recommendations your Commissioners desire to express their opinion that the extension of either Collins-street or Bourke-street, or both, as proposed, would not connect the city with the proposed docks in such a way as to afford a means of access thereto that would be generally used in the carriage of any but the lighter description of goods. The great bulk of the goods traffic, they consider, would still continue to go along Flinders-street, with the exception perhaps of goods required for some of the northern suburbs, which would be taken along the street leading in that direction affording the easiest gradient, namely, La Trobe-street.

16. They would also point to the vast and rapid increase in the Victorian Railway traffic during the past few years, and to the probability that this traffic is certain to continue increasing in a still greater ratio, considering the recent connexion with South Australia, and the prospective junction with the railway systems of the other Australian colonies. Your Commissioners are of opinion that the importance of the Government retaining a large area available in the future for railway purposes, particularly at the principal terminus, can scarcely be over-estimated.

17. The Spencer-street terminus is now connected with about 5,000 miles of railway, and the requirements arising from railway extension in Victoria and in the other colonies must be felt in a continually increasing pressure for accommodation and space. It must not be forgotten that in 1886 a large addition to the Railway Reserve was made on the urgent request of the Railways Commissioners, and although the area of the Reserve may appear large at present, and although portions of it are now devoted to purposes of comparatively unimportant character, it is evident that before the lapse of many years the whole of it will be required for station and other accommodation.

18. It is true that some large railway companies in the United Kingdom, and elsewhere, conduct their business with passenger stations having a very small area; but your Commissioners think that this arises from necessity rather than choice, and they are of opinion that no comparison can be fairly made between the railway systems owned by these private companies and a great system such as that of the Victorian Railways, which is national property, with one large terminus, the City of Melbourne, for the ever-increasing Victorian and Intercolonial Railway traffic.
19. Your Commissioners feel confident that, if any portion of the Railway Reserve were at present alienated, other than what is necessary to carry out their recommendations, the requirements of the Railway system would be so urgent in a very few years as most probably to compel the re-purchase of the land at an enormous advance on its present value.

20. Your Commissioners have the honour to submit for the elucidation of their Report and of the evidence the following plans:—

Plan A.—Showing West Melbourne Swamp, Railway Reserves, and Site of Proposed Docks.

Plan B.—Showing land which would be excised from the Railway Reserve if Spencer-street Station were moved north of Bourke-street; also the corresponding area required in lieu of the same as stated by the Railways Commissioners.

Plan C.—Showing proposed street improvements, &c., as recommended by your Commissioners.

All which we have the honour to submit for Your Excellency's consideration.

Witness our hands and seals this eighteenth day of August, A.D. 1887.

A. L. TUCKER, Chairman. (L.S.)
F. T. SARGOOD, (L.S.)
D. M. DAVIES, (L.S.)
A. J. SKENE, (L.S.)
N. THORNLEY, (L.S.)
P. WRIGHT, (L.S.)
JOHN A. WALLACE, (L.S.)
WILLIAM ANDERSON, (L.S.)
WALTER MADDEN, (L.S.)
J. H. WHEELER, (L.S.)
ROBERT BURROWES, (L.S.)
CLEMENT HODGKINSON. (L.S.)

A. W. VINES,
Secretary to the Commission.
PROTEST.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY—

We, the undersigned Members of the Royal Commission relative to the Extension of the City of Melbourne Westward, decline to sign the above Report. With regard to which we object—

To Paragraph 4.—Because it implies that the streets if extended would only lead to and shut upon the Gas Works, whereas the plan submitted by the City Surveyor of Melbourne showed them intersected or curved towards and to give access to the thoroughfares at the head of the docks and thereby to the land available for sale and occupation in the swamp (vide plan).

To Paragraph 5.—Because it omits to state that most competent evidence was given to the contrary; notably that of one of the best authorities on the subject, Mr. Thomas Walker, who has been extensively engaged in the carrying trade in Melbourne since 1833, and whose statement is to the effect that even with those steep gradients, Bourke street, Collins street, and the smaller parallel streets proposed to be extended would be largely used for the cartage of goods to and from the stores in the centre of Melbourne, and most willingly by vehicles proceeding to the docks with and for loading, and by passenger vehicles, to the great relief of the heavy traffic in other streets (2344-5).

To Paragraph 6.—For naming 1 in 30 as the easiest possible gradient in La Trobe street, whereas (per Mr. Commissioner Hodgkinson, 2102, and answer 2107) that street, if extended over the railway, can be approached either from the railway yard or the dock quay at any gradient down to 1 in 40.

To Paragraphs 7 and 8.—For inaccuracy in statements, and in calculations based thereon, and given in connexion therewith in Appendix D, Subdivisions (A) and (B).

As to statements:—The cost of removing the station buildings, and building a new station, new offices, &c., is set off in decrease of the gain of two millions sterling which would accrue to the State by the suggested exchange and sale of land, whereas such new station and offices are to be erected, even if no such exchange or sale take place. Their erection is therefore not contingent upon nor chargeable to such exchange and sale. And even if chargeable, whilst stating that the accommodation would perhaps have to be on an improved design, no credit is given for the value of such improvement.

And as to the estimates:—They are misleading, for, whilst £263,250 is charged for cutting down the high land if the station were placed north of Bourke-street, and £131,625 if north of Collins-street, which paragraph 7 says that no allowance can be made for as spoil, because the department is doubtful when it could be utilized for filling purposes, wherefore it could not be considered an immediate factor in the cost of moving the station, and under any circumstances its value as spoil is set down at only 1s. per cubic yard; it is a fact within the knowledge of at least one of the undersigned, that a large portion of the excavation is suitable for ballast, worth to the Railways Commissioners say 3s. per cubic yard, and the remainder excellent material for filling up the extensive area of low land recently occupied by the department, and for which the department has lately been purchasing stuff as filling at a cost in one case of 4d. per cubic yard for mere right of removal, and from a greater distance; and in others at 1s. 6d. per load, equal to 2s. 6d. per cubic yard. Therefore this cutting should have been accounted a valuable asset, more than equal to the sum charged for excavating it. And that sum should consequently be expunged from the estimate.
These estimates apart from other items are capable of correction as follows:

(A.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated cost of new station, &amp;c., to Collins-street</td>
<td>£741,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDUCT—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“2. Cutting down high land on new area, 1213,500 cubic yards, at 2s. 2d.”</td>
<td>£131,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations necessary for new station at Collins-street, whether city extended or not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Covered passenger platforms</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Uncovered passenger platforms</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Station buildings</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Offices</td>
<td>29,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contingent on re-erection of station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Permanent viaduct for Dudley-street</td>
<td>112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A glance at other items in the estimate will show that there is no justification for these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sundries</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Contingencies and supervision</td>
<td>98,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct</td>
<td>425,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the estimate to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated amount to be received from sale of land</td>
<td>£1,318,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost of purchasing equivalent area</td>
<td>329,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit balance on sale of land</td>
<td>£997,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct reduced estimate for change of station ground as above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315,950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gain to the colony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£681,775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated cost of new station, &amp;c., to Bourke-street</td>
<td>£1,061,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDUCT—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“2. Cutting down high land on new area, 2430,000 cubic yards, at 2s. 2d.”</td>
<td>£263,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alterations necessary for new station at Collins-street, as proposed by the Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Covered passenger platforms</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Uncovered passenger platforms</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Station buildings</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Offices</td>
<td>29,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not contingent on suggested erection of station at Bourke-street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Permanent viaduct for Dudley-street</td>
<td>157,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. New North Melbourne Station and bridge and approaches</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A glance at the other items in the estimate will show that these are not justified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Sundries</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Contingencies and supervision</td>
<td>138,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct</td>
<td>676,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the estimate to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£2,000,006</td>
<td>382,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which deducted from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1,617,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would give a credit balance to the country of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1,617,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And leave the Railway Department in possession of as large an area of land as if no exchange had taken place.

To profit above shown should also be added the increase in selling value to the Crown, which the West Melbourne Swamp land would acquire by reason of being put in direct communication with the centre of the city, and which increase in value, as pointed out by the Hon. Thomas Loader, will otherwise be lost (921).

To Paragraph 9.—For inaccuracy in describing Flinders-street from Spring-street to Spencer-street as practically the only roadway used to the wharves. The most competent evidence received being that traffic going from the wharf to the northward, so soon as it escapes from the dangerous gut at the railway land into Flinders-street does not, as a rule, go along that street, but turns up Spencer-street northward, notwithstanding the steepness of the gradient (2842).

To Paragraph 10.—As being entirely misleading in stating:—

(1.)—“That the weight of evidence is greatly in favour of maintaining the present railway reserve intact.” Of the 27 witnesses examined, 13 were in favour of extension of the City, viz.:—Messieurs Cain, Mayor; Fitz Gibbon, Town Clerk; Loader, Harbour Trust Commissioner, merchant and manufacturer; Fehon, ex-Traffic Superintendent and carrier; O’Malley, ex-Traffic Inspector; Russell, M. Inst. C.E.; Thwaites, Engineer Public Works Department; Mountain, City Surveyor; Wotherspoon, C.E.; Fenwick, City Councillor, ex-Mayor, and merchant; Thomas Walker, contracting carter; Williams Williams, ex-Mayor and merchant; and T. McPherson, ex-Mayor and merchant. Eleven were against extension of the city, viz.:—Hon. J. Woods, ex-Minister for Railways; Messrs. Speight and Greene, Railways Commissioners; Watson, Engineer-in-Chief; Lunt, Engineer for Existing Lines; Martin and R. G. Ford, ex-Railway Officers; and Brady and Pullarton, Harbour Trust Officers. Two expressed no opinion as to extension, but protested against removal of the Station further away from their localities, viz.: the Town Clerks of South Melbourne and Port Melbourne. And one was examined merely as to valuations, viz., Mr. J. B. Hutton. Perusal of the evidence will show that such of it as was in favour of maintaining the railway land as at present was given almost exclusively by Commissioners or Officers of the Railway Department, or others heretofore connected with it; and with bias towards the Department’s interest or convenience (doubtless in the public interest from their point of view), so marked as to elicit strong comment from independent and well-informed witnesses, wholly unconnected with the City Council, one of whom said (920)—“It seems to me, with the highest respect for the railway officials, with many of whom I have the honour of personal friendship, that they have made themselves into a concrete mass of opinion that they will have it this way and no other way, and they entirely ignore the great mass of citizens in the matter.” And another, in answer to question (2961)—“If the Railway Department say they would rather have the land for the more convenient working of the system, would you still persist in your view?—I daresay they do; I have always had the impression that the railway people make their own claim superior to that of the general public.”

(2.) It was pointed out with much force that the position of the Spencer-street terminus is a central one.” To which it is replied that no proposal has been made to remove the terminus from Spencer-street, but only to place it in that street “end on” to Bourke-street, instead of “end on” to Collins-street, which is what is proposed by the Railway Department.

(3.)—“It was urged that if the passenger and goods stations were placed further back, such a course would be ... directly opposed to the policy adopted in important railway systems in other parts of the world, where the constant endeavour is to extend railways further into the centre of population.” The phrase “further back” is misapplied, and the suggestion that the terminus at Bourke-street instead of Collins-street would be less central is an error. The General Post Office is, and always has been, held to be the centre of the population and business of the metropolis; the terminus at Bourke-street would be 10 chains nearer to it than if at Collins-street, therefore the station so placed would not be “further back” from, but further forward towards the centre, and the so placing it would not be opposed to, but in accordance with, what is stated to be the policy of important railway systems elsewhere.
(4.)—“Such a course would be inconvenient to the general public.” How that can result from having the railway terminus ten chains “further forward” towards the centre of the city is difficult of comprehension, more especially as that is the exact spot from which the trams start up Bourke-street and down Spencer and along Flinders streets, so placing the station in tramway communication with all parts of the city and the suburbs.

(5.)—“Unfavorable to the producing interests of the country. The cost of carriage of goods, always an important item, would also be increased.” Again, it passes comprehension what there can be unfavorable to the producing interests of the country in having the railway terminus placed nearer to the centre of the metropolis and of the limits within which all witnesses as to cartage agreed that goods are carted at a uniform rate, viz.—between the wharves or railway allotments and Spring-street, Victoria-street, and Flinders-street. Or how it could be supposed that the Council of the City of Melbourne or the business men of the metropolis would advocate any proceeding which could be shown to have that effect. Yet it is certain that such a notion was impressed upon the majority of the Commissioners representing country districts. And as the special matter in which it was, at the meetings of the Commission, urged that the producing interests of the country might suffer was the cost of cartage in Melbourne of the goods brought thither by railway, we cannot refrain from expressing our regret that the report should contain the statement that such cost would be increased. The evidence was exactly to the contrary. Six competent witnesses were examined upon the point, of whom only one, Mr. Robert Hall, of the carrying firm of Hall and Gillespie, without stating that there would be an increase, left room for such a supposition (2453). The evidence of all the others was that there would be no such increase, for proof of which reference is asked to the evidence of Mr. W. M. Fehon, late traffic superintendent of Victorian Railways, and a member of the carrying firm of Wm. McCulloch and Co. (1109); Mr. Orlando Fenwick, for upwards of 30 years a merchant of Melbourne (2275); Mr. Thos. Mcllerson, machinery merchant, a resident of West Melbourne for a similar period (2698–2700, 2709, and 2724–2779); Mr. Andrew Kerr, of the firm of Halstead and Kerr, timber merchants (2811, 2815, 2819, 2822); and Mr. Thos. Walker, the oldest and most experienced wharfinger and carrier in the metropolis (2352–2354).

Paragraph 10 concludes with a further statement that, as against the averments which we have objected to above, and in support of the opinion that there would be no material increase in cost of cartage, by reason of the shifting of the station, evidence was given by the Mayor and the Town Clerk of Melbourne and other witnesses representing the City Corporation. This is an error. None of the witnesses named above represented the City Corporation, but their own views as experienced business men, and neither the Mayor nor the Town Clerk gave any evidence as to cartage.

The suggestion that witnesses who differed from the views of the Railway Department represented the City Corporation is in accord with the notion which appears to have been assumed, that the City Council has some special and interested object in moving in the matter, as to which it is only fair to the corporation of the city to refer to the fact as stated in the evidence of the town clerk (32), that from 1855 downwards the corporation could have been in receipt of rates for land in Flinders-street between the metallised roadway and the Queen’s Wharf, which the then head of the Railway Department endeavoured to lease or sell, but was prevented by the corporation, who denied his legal power to so deal with the area, and insisted then and ever since upon its being kept open and unencumbered with a view to the construction of the railway viaduct upon it, so that it is to the corporation of the city that the Railway Department and the colony are indebted for possession of the land for such connexion, which otherwise money could not now have bought back. The City Council might be excused were it to regret having exercised such public spirited disinterestedness and forethought, since it finds that this same viaduct is now converted into one of the principal objections to the extension of the city westward.

To Paragraph 11.—The appearance of the town clerks of South Melbourne and of Port Melbourne before the committee and the evidence given by them should scarcely have justified special mention, nor the statement that they had any authority to speak for the residents of the southern suburbs,
To Paragraph 15.—As previously pointed out, the best evidence obtainable was to the contrary of this paragraph, which seems to take no account of the Melbourne warehouses, or the information given as to the route followed by the traffic northwards. (See also answer 2581.)

As to the subsequent paragraphs of the Report which dwell upon the past and prospective increase of business of the Victorian Railways, and the wisdom of retaining a large area of land available for station purposes in Melbourne, they would be in point were a proposal made to lessen the quantity of land intrusted to the Railway Department. But there is no such proposal; for every acre of land between Bourke-street and Flinders-street, required for extension of the city streets, an equal or greater quantity can be had to the west, or on the north of the station reserve. And whilst the department is in possession of a block of 429 acres, an area which is not only beyond all comparison far and away larger than is devoted to any single railway terminus station in the world, but is larger by nearly one-half than all the terminal stations combined of all the great railway companies of England for passengers, goods and workshops, within a radius of three miles from the General Post-office in London, and serving for the carrying necessities in persons and goods of 4,000,000 of inhabitants of the capital, and 30,000,000 throughout the country—it should not be a difficult matter to so arrange upon that vast area as to remove the obstruction of the city streets, for which there is no parallel anywhere: To give to the projected docks the accommodation of ordinary traffic, which is indispensable to business: And to furnish thoroughfares connecting with the city the saleable Crown land extending westward to the Saltwater river.

The inducements to overcome the difficulty are of the strongest, for not only would public convenience, and the interests of the producing class throughout the colony, as well as the trading, commercial, and general interests of the country and of the metropolis, be served, but something like a million and a half of money could be gained to the State in profit upon the sale of the frontages to the extended streets, and a large sum likewise in increased value to the swamp land which will otherwise be lost to the colony.

And as to the recommendations of the Report given in paragraph 14, we look upon it that the question remitted to the Commission was whether the advantages of access to the docks and the land beyond, by means of the prolongation westward of Bourke-street and streets southward of it, would outweigh the disadvantages to the Railway Department.

The question itself implied the necessity of access, and all the witnesses admitted that necessity.

It was stated that overhead bridges would be costly, and practically useless, and that the access could not be by a subway.

Flinders-street, though widened, would not admit of the traffic being dispersed when it reaches Spencer-street any more than at present, as so much of that traffic as does not turn northward will keep on towards Elizabeth-street, and be choked in again at Market-street, the gradient of which (1 in 15) is one of the steepest in Melbourne.

Therefore the question is, will it be better to place the station further north? And we say yes—to Bourke-street.

First.—The inconvenience to the passenger traffic will be nil; and the railway station will be nearer to the centre of the city, and its largest stores and warehouses.

Secondly.—That there would be inconvenience by increased cost of cartage is disproved, as it would bring the station nearer the centre of the radius within which goods are carted at a uniform rate.

Thirdly.—The inconvenience to the working of the railway is also nil, because the works to be removed can be provided for by other land in the swamp, or on the northward of the station.

It is only in connexion with the question of removal that the commercial aspect comes forward as regards the sale of land: and, whatever value may be put on the land,
it is enough for our purpose to show that the State would not lose, while the whole community would have a direct benefit by the access.

We therefore dissent from the Report, and from the recommendations of the following sub-sections of paragraph 14, viz.—The recommendations of sub-section No. 1; those of sub-section No. 2, in so far as relates to Flinders-street, east of Spencer-street; and those of sub-section No. 3, because better access would be afforded by the plan hereinafter mentioned. We submit, instead, that the evidence abundantly proves the advisability of carrying out such an arrangement as is indicated upon the plan placed before the Commission by the City Surveyor of Melbourne, which suggests:

That the passenger station be constructed end on, fronting the northern side of an extension of the alignment, and upon the level of Bourke-street; and the goods station upon adjoining land.

That immediately under and along the southern wall of the station embankment a street be constructed from Spencer-street towards the docks, as a practical, though slightly indirect, continuation of Bourke-street.

That Little Collins-street, Collins-street, and other streets to the southward be likewise extended westerly, in manner shown upon the plan.

And that by an amendment of description in Schedule 63 of Act No. 821 authority be obtained to construct the viaduct at a distance at its commencing point of about 14 chains west of Spencer-street, whereby its curve will be greatly improved, and the levels of the streets so extended will be made more easy for the traffic.

In conclusion, we deem it right to direct attention to the evidence, answers 2386 to 2393, and elsewhere, which proved the expediency of easing the enormous goods traffic which it seems to be the desire of the Railway Department to congest at Spencer-street; by establishing ample goods depots at convenient places upon the outer circle or other railway lines passing through the suburbs, so decreasing the necessity for such an immense area at Spencer-street; and at the same time preventing waste in railway haulage and subsequent carting of goods, which, to quote from the answers above cited, "are dragged from Gippsland, hauled through Flinders-street, and deposited on the levels there; and then we go and cart that timber back to Hawthorn, South Yarra, Prahran, and other places." "It has to be borne in mind that few people live about this district" (the Spencer-street goods station), "you have to take goods and timber to the districts where the people live, and the idea of bringing it past people's doors and taking it back: It is an enormous expense to some one. It does not go by magic, it has to be paid for." We would ask what would be thought of a suggestion that all the railway goods traffic of London should be concentrated and carried on within three-quarters of a mile of the General Post-office there?

And we cannot refrain from remarking as to the centralization so frequently complained of by Members of Parliament representing country districts, that a proposal which would afford the Railway Commissioners means wherewith to erect a terminal station suitable to the requirements of the department and the convenience of all who use the railways, and at the same time furnish more than a million and a half of money to the country by the sale of city property, is one which ought to command itself to the approval of every country representative.

WILLIAM CAIN,
GEO. COPPIN,
JOHN LAURENS.

Mr. Alderman James Cooper Stewart, a member of the Commission, has, whilst this protest was in preparation, left the colony for England, on his affairs, but has authorized me to state that he concurs in the general conclusions above set forth.

WILLIAM CAIN.
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APPENDIX A.

SYNOPSIS OF A PROPOSED DOCK SYSTEM FOR THE CITY OF MELBOURNE, AND INCLUDING PROPOSALS FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE CITY WESTWARDS, AND THE CONNEXION OF THE SPENCER-STREET AND FLINDERS-STREET RAILWAYS, WITH HIGH AND LOW LEVEL TERMINI, ETC., BY M. RUSSELL, M.C.E.

7A Exchange, Collins-street, Melbourne, October, 1886.

It will be perceived that in the following proposals the writer has endeavoured to formulate a scheme or system which, whilst it preserves the comprehensive objects set forth under the above heading, also to a large degree reconciles the somewhat conflicting suggestions upon the subject which have from time to time preceded the present design.

PROPOSED DOCK SYSTEM.

By referring to Drawing No. 1, it will be seen that the suggestions and selection made by Sir John Cooke and Mr. Brady, C.E., are adopted by the writer as regards the site for the first dock to be constructed, viz., on the north bank of the River Yarra, and lying between the railway reserve, Spencer-street, and Dudley-street. It is, however, proposed that the form or shape of the dock should be that shown in Drawings 1 and 8, as affording the maximum advantage of the present condition of the unoccupied area of land lying to the north and westward of the Gas Company's land, and also as fitting in most conveniently with the proposed extension of some of the city's principal streets, i.e., Flinders-street, Collins-street, and Latrobe-street.

The writer also proposes that the dock should be constructed with timber lining or berthing (in lieu of with stone walls), and that the construction thereof should be similar to that shown by the details on Drawing No. 9. He is, of course, aware that Sir John Cooke has disapproved, and Mr. Brady, C.E., favoured, the idea of constructing this dock with timber lining; but the instability and nature of the ground at this site are, the writer thinks, strongly adverse to the adoption of the costly and so-called permanent form of masonry lining proposed under Sir John Cooke's plans, and afford at the same time tolerably strong, if not conclusive, reasons why some such scheme of timber lining as that recommended by Mr. Brady and opposed by Sir John Cooke should be adopted.

The nature of the ground was perfectly satisfactory, and calculated to afford effective support—at a reasonable cost—for the foundations of the masonry walls; the writer considers that it would be unwise, both as regards economy and skillful engineering, to adopt any other and less permanent method of construction. But Sir John Cooke, in his report dated 27th May last (published in August, 22nd July), states:—

"That a satisfactory foundations for the masonry lining can only be obtained by drying the whole area of the dock excavation, and founding the walls on close piling," &c.

And a little further on he says:—

"... The close piling would be carried well down into the clay... the act of driving piles at close intervals would consolidate the material they passed through, and considerably increase their bearing power before reaching the harder strata which would be relied upon mainly to carry the work."

Concerning, as the writer does, with the opinions expressed in both these paragraphs, he considers that they also contain in themselves very strong arguments, or grounds for argument, in favour of another form of construction than that of masonry walls being adopted; and he holds that a perfectly stable, and at the same time a comparatively very economical form of dock lining in timber can be substituted.

Before describing the same, however, the following further extract from Sir John Cooke's report is submitted for perusal:—

"... Taking therefore the borings put down in 1878 and 1885 only, it will be seen in the case of a timber facing that the piles would require to be of a great length in order to reach a tolerably stiff stratum, and that it would still require to be driven into the harder material, as they would receive but little support from the soft stratum through which they would have previously passed. The enormous leverage to which such a structure would be thus subjected is, in my opinion, a fatal objection to its employment."

The method and form of dock construction proposed by the writer are as follows:—

In the first place no "drying of the area of the dock excavations" would be necessary. A cover dam would be required to construct the retention of the water's edge, &c., of the entrance to the dock if same are to be built of masonry, as they should preferably, though of course not necessarily be. The graving dock walls, entrance, &c., would require to be similarly dealt with whenever its construction was undertaken.

The first portion of the excavation to be commenced would be that on the lines to be adopted by the proposed berthing, and when dredged or excavated to the requisite depth—i.e. to give, say, 37 feet of water at low tide—the banks or sides of the dock excavations would be sloped at an inclination of 1 in 4, and as completed these slopes should be turfed, or sown with suitable root-spreading swamp grasses or vegetation, in manner similar to that adopted in the formation of reservoirs for conservation of a water supply.

The outer row of piling (driven to a batter of, say, 1 in 20), and the fender or mooring, together with the second tier of piling, to be grouted in the manner shown on details thereof on Drawing No. 2, and the remainder of the piles to be driven in the usual manner—i.e. without the "cradling"—as they will be nearly their whole lengths in the ground.

It is assumed that Tasmanian blue gum, Western Australian gum, New South Wales turpentining, or New Zealand Totara pines of 65 feet in length can be obtained and be employed in these outer rows of piling; piles of this length were used by the writer in what construction in the piers of bridges in New Zealand, many years since, as also the system of timber "cradling" shown on Drawing No. 2, in the case of piles driven in soft harbour soil, and with perfect success, a very rigid superstructure to the wharfage being obtained upon piling thus treated.

It, however, should be easy difficulty in obtaining so large a number of piles as would be required for this work of a length of 65 feet, a system of "scarfing" the piles can be resorted to with perfect safety; the magnificent hardwoods of these colonies enabling the engineer to make the most of this expedient in construction, as is proved by many instances of bridge building on pile foundations, and with scarfed piling to the piers thereof, which have come within the writer's experience, and, doubtless, in that also of many other engineers who have constructed similar works in these colonies.

The driving of a large number of piles at comparatively short distances apart consolidate the ground very considerably (as appears from the fact of a form of "cradling" shown on Drawing No. 2, giving immensely increased stability and bearing power to the piling; and the writer feels warranted, by his experience of the result obtained from actual experiment of this system, in asserting that a timber lining to the dock, if thus constructed, would possess ample rigidity, stability, and, first cost considered, durability.
The cost of this plan of timber lining or wharfage complete would probably be less than, and certainly not be in excess of, the cost of close piling required as a first nutation for the foundations of a messy-lined dock, seeing that, in order to carry out that form of construction, it would also be necessary, as Mr. John Coode states, "to dry the area of the dock excavations."

The writer need not explain to the professional critic of these proposals that it is evident a timber structure such as that above described would certainly not be subjected to any "enormous leverage," such as would constitute the "fatal disadvantage" referred to in the portion of Sir John Coode's report quoted by the writer. The banks of the dock (considered merely as the banks of any ordinary reservoir, with the additional conditions of breadth,etc., for deep water and various others) could be at their natural angle of repose, and therefore solid, dependent and supporting, and throwing no weight, nor exerting any leverage whatever on account of the pile lining or wharfage.

When adopting, upon economical grounds, this form of dock construction, the writer takes into account the following unusual advantages which the site proposed affords:

1. There is no considerable rise and fall of tides, such as English engineers are accustomed to encounter and have to provide for in their dock works; and there would consequently be no severe denuding or scouring away of the efflorescent lime, whereby the shores or banks of our dock would be in their more correct, perhaps, to term it, "tidal basin," seeing that it is not necessary to "lock" it.

2. The tide proposed for this dock—viz., long and comparatively narrow—affords ample berthage for present requirements, and abundant opportunity for adding thereto, by piers extended where and when necessary into the "basin;" at the same time the expanse of water forming the "basin," or dock, would not be so great as to permit of undesirable, and possibly injurious "wave" action being created in severe wind storms.

3. The dock would occupy a considerable extent a site which, as regards present levels, is the most suitable for it, and one at which the works of excavation, dredging, raising the levels of the surrounding sites for the extension of the streets, buildings site, &c., and the construction of the timber wharfage, could all be carried on concurrently; and the much-needed dock would of course be an accomplished fact in a very much shorter time than it would be possible if a stone wall structure were to be undertaken.

With respect to the area of the proposed dock and the extent of wharfage or berthage, it will be seen by reference to Drawing No. 2 that the former comprises 73 acres, and that there are 8,900 feet of berthage provided.

These figures approximate pretty closely with those afforded by Sir John Coode's plan, which provides an area of 63 acres, and 1,370 feet of berthage (exclusive of additional berthage in both proposed wharfage), as follows:

For convenience of comparison, it may be here stated that the admirable naturally-formed dock or basin at Sydney, now known as "The Circular Quay" (or Sydney Cove), has an area of 7 acres, and the splendid system of docks at Cardiff, in Wales, Great Britain, known as "The Bute Docks," comprise a total area of 111 acres, including the grand dock now in course of construction, known as "The Royal;" the area thereof is 33 acres, and length of berthing 5,000 feet.

The accommodation which would be afforded by the first of our proposed docks (that at A on Drawing No. 1), together with that obtained by the additional wharfage to be provided at the adjacent northern bank of the River Yarra, &c., would be sufficient to meet the requirements of the city, but nature has lavished in respect of affording very abundant and excellent sites for a vast system of docks and basins such as the city of Melbourne will in all probability, at no greatly distant period of time, require.

The writer has been firstly induced by the letter, as well as D, other very excellent and naturally well-adapted sites for a system of future dock extensions; and these sites should, he ventures to think, be carefully and closely reserved, and secured to the public for such purposes.

The drawing between Sundridge Park and the River Yarra, is very especially adapted for an extensive dock and basin system, such as shown on Drawing No. 1 as "Imperial Docks Nos. 1 and 2," and wherein probably even the largest vessels of future commercial or royal navies could be most conveniently accommodated; and by a dredged channel, direct entrance therefrom might be afforded so as to avoid the Yarra channel altogether.

The total areas of the docks shown, and length of berthage provided, on Drawing No. 1, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of dock</th>
<th>Feet of Berthage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A, area of dock</td>
<td>75 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, area of dock</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, area of dock</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, area of dock</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 546 acres and 61,400 feet.

Proposed Extension of the city westwards; and connection of Spencer-street and Flinders-street Railway Systems, with high and low level termini, &c.

It will be seen, by reference to Plans 1 and 2, that while proposing to provide for the desired opening up of the locality to be formed by the dock at A, for connecting therewith the entire dock, and the thereby effecting its extension westwards, the writer very largely considers the existing costly permanent way and works, and the numerous railway shores and buildings erected within the reserve at Spencer-street.

The engineer (of many years practice and experience in these matters) is well aware of the immense outlay of money which would be involved in, as well as actual loss incurred by, any very radical removal, or interference with such an extensive system of railway works as that now in existence at the important, yet disunited and somewhat scattered terminal station yards at Spencer-street and Flinders-street; and any sweeping removal of these works, such as would be involved, for instance, by the adoption of Mr. Fenton's proposals for the extension of the city by the resumption of the present railway reserve, is now scarcely practicable, and certainly not to be recommended.

But a very considerable step in this much desired direction can be made if the proposals shown on Drawings 2 and 3 were to be adopted, and they may be briefly described as follows:

1. That Flinders-street should be widened and extended in the direction of, and to connect with, the site of the proposed dock at A, as shown on these plans.

2. That a combined high and low level terminus be erected (in such sections and from time to time as required), with high-level road approach parallel to Spencer-street, and on the site shown on Drawing No. 3. This terminus to be so constructed that the present low-level system of lines shall be retained and accommodated as far as practicable and desired, and in harmony with the new arrangement of this station yard at the high-level road terminus.

3. That the new high-level portion of the Spencer-street system of lines be connected with the new terminus, and high and low level system at Flinders-street, with light iron viaduct and road bridges over Collins-street west extension, Flinders-street, as shown in part on Drawing No. 3.

4. That concurrently with the construction of the dock works at A, and the formation of the new streets and building areas surrounding the same, the present goods sheds, &c., which now block the extension of Collins-street westwardly be partially reserved, as a means of extending the dock at A (separate from Flinders-street); and that the materials be resited either in building on to and extending in a northwesterly direction the portion of the sheds left standing, or in the erection of similar buildings in some other part of the Railway Reserve; such as at the sites shown indifferently on Drawing No. 3, for this form.

5. The extension of Collins-street west so as to connect it with the dock site, &c., to be then completed.

6. No extension or thoroughfare across the Railway Reserve is proposed to be afforded at either Bourke-street or Lonsdale-street, as the requirements of the new terminus when completed would procure this being done at all conveniently.

Beyond these streets are provided for to the westward of the Railway Reserve, and the town would be extended as a thoroughfare under the high-level system and over the low-level system of lines by means of the crossing shown on Drawing No. 3, or by means of a high-level road bridge and approaches spanning both these systems, and by a railway, &c.
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[Excerpts from a document regarding railway extensions and considerations.]

[Text continues with a discussion on costs, traffic, and proposed solutions.]

R. SPEIGHT, Chairman.
R. FORD.
W. R. GREENE, Commissioners.

The Honorable A. L. Tucker, M.P.,
Chairman Royal Commission of Extension of the City Westward,
Melbourne.
APPENDIX C.

74 Exchange, Collins-street, Melbourne, 17th May, 1887.

SIR,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of the Report of the Commissioners for Railways upon the scheme submitted to you by me for the Extension of the City Westwards.

In this Report I regret to observe that the Commissioners have dealt with my sketch plans and mere outline proposals as though they were detail drawings, prepared by me with all the necessary data at my disposal for determining curves, gradients, and the hundred other matters incidental to the development of a large scheme such as this is.

I desire, in reply to some of the principal points raised by the Commissioners, to state:—

1. My scheme—even if adopted without modification—would only alienate about 18 acres out of the 110 acres occupied by the "Railway Reserve" and that the balance of, say, 90 acres of "City lands" would be regarded by most railway engineers as very ample indeed for "terminal" purposes, and, if properly utilised, should be sufficient for even the future requirements of the Railway Commissioners of this city.

2. I wish distinctly to state that I have not put forward any specific "design for a railway terminus," but have merely furnished sketch suggestions showing a high and low level terminus (or partly "terminal" station). But even this sketch design does admit of "end on" platforms, and also of common approaches to all the platforms, both those at high and low levels. Nothing, however, but properly prepared working drawings could show all such matters clearly and the Commissioners might—venture to think—have considered that, with a scale of 200 feet to an inch, it was not likely I should have attempted to define any details whatsoever of the scheme.

3. The total area of the platforms shown in my "Spencer-street" is something like 4 acres, and they provide 6,400 (six thousand four hundred) feet of platform in all; and, in this respect, therefore, they are certainly capable of accommodating the terminal traffic of an infinitely larger city than Melbourne. At the present time the great "Race Meeting" traffic is really accommodated on a single platform of less than one-eighth part of the area and length which would be provided in my "sketch" design.

4. The radii of the curves shown on my sketch plans are no instances stated by me; and although I find that the connecting curve between the Spencer-street and Flinders-street systems is inadverently shown as a six-chain curve, I think it might have been disregarded by the Commissioners (as being evident in draughting) and especially so, seeing that there is not the slightest difficulty in effecting the connection of the two systems by a curve of ample radius—and that too "without seriously interfering with private property in Flinders-street."

5. To the objection that no provision is made in my scheme for platform lines, sidings, goods traffic, &c., &c., I have only again to remark that my plans are sketch suggestions only—to a scale of 200 feet to an inch; and that only by proper detail drawings, prepared with a full knowledge of all existing works, levels, &c., &c., could such information be expected to be furnished. That I, or any other railway engineer, could prepare such details without such data is unfair to suppose.

In conclusion, I desire most respectfully to add that, if I had put my plans forward as anything more than "suggestions" or sketches, I should have merited that they should have been subjected to even a more minute criticism than that accorded to them by the Commissioners.

I desired simply to suggest that, if a properly worked out scheme of a combined "high and low level" system were to be adopted—and be gradually carried out—a great economising of space, and yet perfect facilities of working, could be effected, and, concurrently therewith, the "Extension of the City Westwards," and most particularly the opening up of Collins-street west, be also provided for.

I still venture to consider that it is an almost imperative necessity that the "Railway Reserve" should not be permitted for all time to block the city's main artery as it now does; and, to vary somewhat the words used by the Commissioners against my schemes, I will say that, unless this serious barrier to our city's "terminal," in the direction of its future docks, is removed, or its removal provided for in conjunction with our future railway termini, &c., "it will inevitably result" that a permanent and very serious national loss will be inflicted by those who shall be responsible for the perpetuation of this barrier to the city's progress by a persistent refusal to admit that its removal is practicable.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Yours very obediently,

M. RUSSELL, M.I.C.E.

The Honorable A. L. Tucker, M.P.,
Chairman Royal Commission on the Extension of the City Westwards.
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**APPENDIX D.**

**EXTENSION OF CITY WESTWARDS.**

Railway Department,
Office of Engineer of Existing Lines,
Melbourne, 8th July, 1887.

**MEMO. FOR A. W. VIZE, ESQ., SECRETARY TO ROYAL COMMISSION.**

In forwarding attached estimates, I would wish to point out that the total amount will be required to carry out the work shown. The value of the material taken out might be calculated as a set-off, equal to one shilling per yard, if it were not so indefinite as to when it could be used for filling purposes.

J. LUNT,
Engineer for Existing Lines.

---

87/8293.

**EXTENSION OF CITY WESTWARDS.**

**MEMO.**

Referring to attached estimates, “A” and “B” for removal of Spencer-street Station to the north of Collins-street and Bourke-street respectively, the works estimated are of a similar character and of the same extent as exist now; nothing is allowed for the value of old materials; on the other hand, nothing is set down for temporary works and accommodation while the new works would be in hand.

The estimates do not include cost of land and compensation, but the cutting down of the high land and forming to the new levels are included.

In each case Dudley-street would require to be carried over the new yard by viaduct, and for this I have included the cost of a permanent viaduct 100 feet wide. In the case of removal to north of Bourke-street, the existing station works and bridge approaches, &c., at North Melbourne would have to be abandoned, and the estimates includes cost of new works for these. Either scheme would render the extension of La Trobe-street by viaduct across the yard more costly than would be required across the present yard by £70,000. The plans show complete development of accommodation which sites would permit.

The Engineer of Existing Lines.

F. RENNICK.

---

(A.)

8293/87.

**EXTENSION OF CITY WESTWARDS.**

**MEMO.**

Estimated Cost of removing Spencer-street Station north of Collins-street, taking in an equal area of land to that surrendered to the City from the high ground between La Trobe street and North Melbourne, as per sketch plan herewith marked “A”:—

1. Forming to new levels portion of present yard to be retained by the Department, say 106 acres @ £125 ... ... ... £13,350
2. Cutting down high land on new area, 1,215,000 c. y. @ 2s. 2d. ... ... ... 281,625
3. Taking up and relaying permanent way, ballast, sleepers, &c., with loss and breakage, 32 miles @ £1,000 ... ... ... 32,000
4. Taking up and relaying points and crossings, 500 sets @ £10 ... ... ... 5,000
5. Galvanized-iron sheds, 2,700 sq. @ £40 ... ... ... 108,000
6. Brick shed, 1,320 sq. @ £52 10s. ... ... ... 69,300
7. Covered goods platform, 400 sq. @ £24 ... ... ... 9,600
8. Uncovered platforms, 300 sq. @ £16 ... ... ... 4,800
9. Covered passenger platforms, 400 sq. @ £22 ... ... ... 8,800
10. Uncovered passenger platforms, 600 sq. @ £13 ... ... ... 7,800
11. Cranes and fixed machinery, say ... ... ... ... 10,000
12. Station buildings, 140 sq. @ £50 ... ... ... ... 8,400
13. Offices, 420 sq. @ £70 ... ... ... ... 29,400
14. Sundry small buildings, say ... ... ... ... 5,000
15. Fencing, gates, &c. ... ... ... ... 3,000
16. Drainage, allow ... ... ... ... 7,000
17. Roads, paving, &c., 40,000 c. y. @ 10s. ... ... ... 20,000
18. Water supply, allow ... ... ... ... 7,000

Carried forward ... ... ... ... £479,975
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brought forward</td>
<td>£479,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Lighting, allow</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Signals and interlocking, allow</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Perim. viad. for Dudley-street across station yard, 1,250 l. f. @ £20</td>
<td>112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sundries, allow</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Contingencies and supervision, 15 per cent.</td>
<td>£644,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90,672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—This estimate does not include cost of land and compensation.

(Sd.) J. LUNT,  
Engineer for Ex. Lines.

F. RENNICK,  
Chief Assistant to Engr. for Existing Lines.

---

(B.)  
Railway Department,  
Office of Engineer of Existing Lines,  
Melbourne, 8th July, 1887.

MEMO.

Estimated Cost of removing Spencer-street Station north of Bourke-street, taking in an equal area of land to that surrendered to the City from the high ground between La Trobe-street and North Melbourne, as per sketch plan herewith marked "B":

1. Forming to new levels portion of present yard to be retained by the Department, say 80 acres @ £500  
   ...  
   £40,000

2. Cutting down high land on new area 2,430,000 c. y. @ 2s. 2d.  
   ...  
   263,250

3. Works (fuel platforms, &c.), now going on in swamp, which would have to be abandoned  
   ...  
   14,000

4. Taking up and relaying permanent way, ballast, sleepers, &c., with loss and breakage, 32 miles @ £1,000  
   ...  
   32,000

5. Taking up and relaying points and crossings, 500 sets @ £10  
   ...  
   5,000

6. Galvanized-iron sheds, 2,700 sq. @ £40  
   ...  
   108,000

7. Brick shed, 1,320 sq. @ £32 10s.  
   ...  
   65,950

8. Covered goods platforms, 400 sq. @ £24  
   ...  
   9,600

9. Uncovered goods platforms, 300 sq. @ £16  
   ...  
   4,800

10. Covered passenger platforms, 400 sq. @ £22  
    ...  
    8,800

11. Uncovered passenger platforms, 600 sq. @ £13  
    ...  
    7,800

12. Cranes and fixed machinery, allow  
    ...  
    10,000

13. Station buildings, 140 sq. @ £20  
    ...  
    8,400

14. Offices, 420 sq. @ £79  
    ...  
    29,400

15. Sundry small buildings, allow  
    ...  
    5,000

16. Fencing, gates, &c., allow  
    ...  
    5,000

17. Drainage, allow  
    ...  
    10,000

18. Roads, paving, &c., 60,000 c. y. @ 10s.  
    ...  
    30,000

19. Water supply, allow  
    ...  
    10,000

20. Lighting, allow  
    ...  
    10,000

21. Signals and interlocking, allow  
    ...  
    20,000

22. Perim. viaduct for Dudley-street across station yard, 1,750 l. f. @ £90  
    ...  
    157,500

23. New North Melbourne station and bridge, and approaches, &c.  
    ...  
    25,000

24. Sundries  
    ...  
    40,000

25. Contingencies and supervision, 15 per cent.  
    ...  
    £922,850

Total  
...  
£1,061,278

Note.—This estimate does not include cost of land and compensation.

(Sd.) J. LUNT,  
Engineer for Existing Lines.

F. RENNICK,  
Chief Assistant to Engr. for Ex. Lines.

5/7/87.
APPENDIX E.

EXTRACTS FROM Sundry Information as to Railway Stations, Mileage, etc.

Prepared by A. M. Alexander, Esq., C.E., Engineer attached to the Commission.


During twenty years the population of London had increased 36 per cent., the average number of journeys per individual 339 per c.Q, and the general travelling 500 per cent. This growth is calculated; it must be remembered, on an incomplete basis, omitting as it does the vast number of season ticket holders, each with an average of probably 600 annual journeys, who emerge every morning from the fourteen great railway stations of the metropolis. Formerly, many of these used to travel backwards and forwards by omnibuses.

With the experience of the past as our guide, we may venture to explore the future and to forecast the annual movement of the population of the metropolis in the year 1895. The truth of our estimate is dependent on the past rate of increase being maintained, and this again depends upon fresh facilities for travel being provided. More trains, omnibuses, and trams must be available, and no doubt will be; but the capacity of the streets and the existing lines will not provide for all the vehicular traffic which London could and would support eight years hence if the means were offered to it. At that time the annual movement will have risen to the enormous total of over 800 million journeys, if engineers will devise the methods and capitalists will provide them.

The trains give a better speed, but they do not usually follow the arterial lines of traffic, and every year the increased value of land renders it more unlikely that they should do so. In devising a new means of transport, the ends to be kept in view are that the line should follow the great thoroughfares, and that it should be carried right into the centre of the business activity of the town.

Alphabetical List of the More Important London Railway Stations, with their Railways, and Distances from Charing Cross.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Railway</th>
<th>Distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad-street</td>
<td>North London</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charing Cross</td>
<td>S. Eastern, Greenwich, Mid. and North Kent</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canary Square</td>
<td>City Terminals for do.</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euston</td>
<td>London and N. Western</td>
<td>1½ miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenchurch-street</td>
<td>Blackwall</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborn Viaduct</td>
<td>Samas trains at Ludgate Hill</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Cross</td>
<td>Great Northern</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool-street</td>
<td>Great Eastern and East London</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludgate Hill</td>
<td>City Terminals of the Metropolitian Extension</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Bridge</td>
<td>Brighton and South Coast</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>Great Western</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pancras</td>
<td>Midland</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>London, Chatham and Dover, Metropolitan Extension, West London do.</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>South Western</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nearest half-mile circle from Charing Cross.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Railway</th>
<th>Area in Sq. Yards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Euston</td>
<td>L. and N.-W.</td>
<td>23,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Cross</td>
<td>Great Northern</td>
<td>22,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pancras</td>
<td>Midland</td>
<td>18,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charing Cross</td>
<td>South-Eastern</td>
<td>13,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddington</td>
<td>Great Western</td>
<td>8,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>L. C. and Dover, &amp;c. (about)</td>
<td>28,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—These areas are measured within the walls and do not represent the area of the station proper, without reference to adjoining station grounds, lines of way, sheds, &c. Further, since this table was compiled, extensive alterations and additions have been made to meet the increasing demands of traffic.

Among the larger stations lately built are:—York Station, with a roofed area of five acres; Central and Bridge-street Stations, Glasgow (north and south of the River Clyde), with a corresponding area of about seven acres.

Carlisle Citadel Station.—This may be quoted as perhaps the most important central station in Great Britain. At this point the following seven railway systems meet and interchange traffic:—London and North-Western, Midland, North-Eastern, Maryport and Carlisle, Caledonian, North British and Glasgow, and South-Western. The station is covered by seven acres of glass roofing, and the area occupied by sidings, sheds, &c., extends to about 100 acres.

The total mileage of the United Kingdom, 31st December, 1885, was 19,169 miles, and the number of passengers carried 697,218,031 (exclusive of season ticket holders). (Whit. A/c. 1887.)
MEMORANDA as to certain Railway Stations.


The Grand Central Station of New York (passenger station) is about the size of Cannon-street station, not more than 900 feet long by 200 feet wide, or under 4 acres. As to the largest railway stations in Paris, where, in consequence of the city being walled and fortified, passenger, goods, and workshop yards, running sheds, &c., are all within the city, the largest space is occupied by the D'Orleans line (Quai d'Austerlitz). The passenger station covers 33 acres; the goods yard, workshops, &c., 97½ acres; total, 130½ acres.

The Chemin de fer Du Nord (Place de Roubaix).—The passenger station covers 34 acres; goods yard, workshops, &c., 87 acres; total, 121 acres.

De L'Ouest (Rue S. Lazan).—Passenger station, 23 acres; goods yard, workshops, &c., 90 acres; total, 113 acres.

De L'Ouest (Boulevard du Mount Parnasse).—Passenger station, 5 acres; goods yard, workshops, &c., 21 acres; total, 26 acres.

De Lyon (Boulevard Mazas).—Passenger station, 16½ acres; workshops, &c., 46 acres; goods yard, 11½ acres; total, 74 acres.

De L'Est (Boulevard de Strasbourg).—Passenger station, 14 acres; goods yard and workshops, 76 acres; total, 90 acres. In all these cases the largest portion of the total area is required for the workshops, running sheds, &c., of the different companies, as before explained.

The foregoing information as to the Parisian railway stations is from measurements from the Atlas Municipal de la Ville de Paris 1876.
MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS.

THURSDAY, 3rd MARCH, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair;

The Hon. Col. F. T. Sargood, C.M.G., M.L.C.,
  J. A. Wallace, M.I.C.,
  N. Thornley, M.L.C.,
  W. Madden, M.P.,
  G. S. Coppin, Esq., M.P.,
  Jno. Laurens, Esq., M.P.,

D. M. Davies, Esq., M.P.,
J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.P.,
Peter Wright, Esq., M.P.,
W. Cain, Esq., Mayor of Melbourne,
J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
Clement Hodgkinson, Esq.,
A. J. Skene, Esq.

On the motion of Mr. Wright, seconded by Mr. Wheeler, it was resolved to meet every alternate week, and to sit on two consecutive days, Thursday and Friday, commencing each day at Two p.m.

On the motion of Mr. Cain, seconded by Mr. Coppin, it was resolved to ask the Lands Department to supply copies of all plans of the West Melbourne Swamp which may be of service to the Commission, together with any information in regard to the character of the strata of the swamp land, records of borings, &c.

Also, the Railway Department to supply a plan of the land required at Spencer-street and North Melbourne for railway purposes, i.e., present and prospective requirements to show proposed means of communication with the projected docks in the West Melbourne Swamp.

Mr. Anderson moved and Col. Sargood seconded, That the city authorities be invited first to give evidence before the Commission.

Mr. Burrowes moved, as an amendment, and Mr. Wheeler seconded, That the Railway Department be invited to give evidence first.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost, and the original motion carried.

It was resolved to summon the Mayor of Melbourne, the Town Clerk, and the City Surveyor to give evidence before the Commission on the 17th instant, and Mr. Splight, the Engineer-in-Chief, and the Engineer for Existing Lines, on the 18th instant.

It was resolved that the press be admitted at the taking of evidence.

Adjourned to Thursday, 17th instant, at Two p.m.

THURSDAY, 17th MARCH, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair;

The Hon. Col. F. T. Sargood, C.M.G., M.L.C.,
  J. A. Wallace, M.I.C.,
  N. Thornley, M.L.C.,
  W. Madden, M.P.,
  G. S. Coppin, Esq., M.P.,
  Jno. Laurens, Esq., M.P.,

J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.P.,
Peter Wright, Esq., M.P.,
W. Cain, Esq., Mayor of Melbourne,
J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
Clement Hodgkinson, Esq.,
A. J. Skene, Esq.

Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.

A letter was read from the Harbour Trust, dated 9th instant, stating that as soon as the Commissioners have decided upon what plan of dock is to be constructed, plans would be supplied as requested.

A letter was read from Mr. Hodgkinson, stating that he had been authorized to inform the Chairman of the Commission that the Melbourne Harbour Trust desire the direct extension of both Flinders-street and Collins-street across the railway station, so as to make provision for the increased traffic that will result from the completion of the projected improvement of the Port of Melbourne.

A letter was read from the Railway Department, in reply to letter from the Secretary to the Commission, stating that the whole of the land now reserved, as per plan attached, for railway purposes will be required for such purposes. Plans were received from the Lands Department for the use of the Commission, showing land reserved for railway purposes, vested in the Harbour Trust, and Crown lands at the West Melbourne Swamp and adjacent thereto.

The Commissioner proceeded to take evidence, and the following witnesses were examined:—E. G. Fitzgibbon, Esq., Town Clerk of Melbourne; W. Cain, Esq., Mayor of Melbourne, and a member of the Commission. Mr. Mountain, City Surveyor, was present in obedience to summons; but it was not considered necessary to take evidence from him, as the City Council had prepared no plan of street extension across the railway reserves, Spencer-street.

Adjourned to next day, at Two p.m.
FRIDAY, 18th MARCH, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair;

The Hon. Col. F. T. Sargood, C.M.G., M.L.C.,
" J. A. Wallace, M.L.C.,
" N. Thornley, M.L.C.,
" W. Madden, M.P.,
W. Anderson, Esq., M.P.,
J. Laurens, Esq., M.P.,

D. M. Davies, Esq., M.P.,
J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.P.,
Peter Wright, Esq., M.P.,
W. Cain, Esq., Mayor of Melbourne,
J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
Clement Hodgkinson, Esq.

R. Speight, Esq., Chairman of the Victorian Railways Commissioners; R. Watson, Esq., Engineer-in-Chief; J. Lunt, Esq., Engineer for Existing Lines, gave evidence.

Mr. Lunt was asked to appear at the next meeting an 31st instant, with sections of proposed street extensions.

The Secretary was instructed to summon as witnesses for the next meeting, 31st instant:—W. H. Greene, Esq., Victorian Railways Commissioner; P. Brady, Esq., Harbour Trust Engineer; Hon. T. Loader; and for the 1st April—W. M. Felton, Esq., Jno. O'Malley, Esq., late District Traffic Superintendent; W. R. Martin, Esq., of Engineer-in-Chief's Branch.

Adjourned to Thursday, 31st instant, at Two p.m.

THURSDAY, 31st MARCH, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair;

The Hon. Col. F. T. Sargood, C.M.G., M.L.C.,
" N. Thornley, M.L.C.,
" R. Burrowes, M.P.,
" Walter Madden, M.P.,
W. Anderson, Esq., M.P.,
G. S. Coppin, Esq., M.P.,
J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.P.,

P. Wright, Esq., M.P.,
J. Laurens, Esq., M.P.,
W. Anderson, Esq., M.P.,
W. Cain, Esq., Mayor of Melbourne,
J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
A. J. Skeene, Esq.,
Clement Hodgkinson, Esq.

Minutes of last meeting read and confirmed.

A letter was read from the Lands Department, under date 23rd instant, to the effect that no record could be found, either in that or the Public Works Department, of any record of borings having been taken in the West Melbourne Swamp.

A lengthy letter was read from Mr. J. Watson Esq., dated 28th instant, containing certain proposals in relation to city extension, construction of bridges, railway alterations, &c., &c.

The Hon. T. Loader and Mr. Brady attended as witnesses, but their evidence had to be postponed—Mr. Loader's until next day, and Mr. Brady's until 14th April.

W. H. Greene, Esq., Commissioner for Railways, and J. Lunt, Esq., Engineer Existing Lines, gave evidence. Mr. Greene was requested to attend next day's meeting.

Adjourned until next day, at Two p.m.

FRIDAY, 1st APRIL, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair;

The Hon. Walter Madden, M.P.,
" Rbt. Burrowes, M.P.,
" N. Thornley, M.L.C.,
J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.P.,
P. Wright, Esq., M.P.,

J. Laurens, Esq., M.P.,
W. Anderson, Esq., M.P.,
W. Cain, Esq., Mayor of Melbourne,
J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
Clement Hodgkinson, Esq.

A note was received from Mr. A. J. Skeene, explaining his inability to attend.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed.

On the motion of Mr. Wheeler, seconded by Mr. Hodgkinson, it was resolved—that the Commission should, on their next day of meeting (14th instant), assemble at 10.30 a.m., for the purpose of personally inspecting the Railway reserve and the localities referred to in the enquiry—the Engineer for Existing Lines (Mr. Lunt) to accompany the Commissioners.

On the motion of the Right Worshipful the Mayor, seconded by Mr. Wright, it was resolved that instruction be given for a valuation to be made of the land fronting on the extensions of all the streets between Flinders-street and Boerke-street, both inclusive, from Spencer-street to the western boundary of the lands claimed by the railways.
On the motion of Mr. Hodgkinson, seconded by Mr. Wright, it was also resolved that an estimate be obtained of the expenditure the department would have to incur in purchasing land north of Latrobe-street and west of Spencer-street equal in area to that which it is proposed shall be given up.

The Acting Secretary was instructed to request Mr. Lunt to furnish an estimate of the cost of altering the railway yard, &c., and supposing the extension of Collins-street were proceeded with and the land to the south given up.

The following witnesses gave evidence:—W. H. Greene, Esq., Railways Commissioner, (re-called) with plan marked B, the Hon. T. Lockyer; W. M. Felton, Esq., J.P.

W. R. Martin, Esq., was in attendance, but his examination was deferred until next meeting, 14th instant, at Two p.m. Adjourned until 14th instant, at Half-past Ten a.m.

THURSDAY, 14TH APRIL, 1887.

In accordance with the resolution passed at last meeting the Commission met at Half-past Ten a.m.

Members present:

The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair;


The Commission, accompanied by Messrs. Philpot and Alexander, proceeded to Montgomery’s brewery in Jeffcott-street, West Melbourne, having been kindly invited by Mr. Montgomery to view the locality of West Melbourne Swamp from the tower of his brewery.

Having ascended the tower, an excellent view of the locality was obtained, and the Chairman, on behalf of the Commission, thanked Mr. Montgomery for his thoughtful kindness in affording such valuable assistance to the Commission.

The members of the Commission then drove to the western end of Latrobe-street to the Dudley-street culvert, North Melbourne railway bridge, and along Flinders-street to below the Gasworks, close to the site of the dock recently determined upon by the Harbour Trust. It was resolved to visit the various sites on another occasion.

Adjourned.

The Commission re-assembled at Two p.m.

Members present:

The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair;


Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.

A note was received from Mr. Lunt, Engineer for Existing Lines, stating that to enable him to give the estimate of the cost of altering the railway yard &c., at Spencer-street, he would require to know the site it is proposed to remove the station to. The Secretary was instructed to reply that the Commission desired to have an estimate of the cost of moving back the station to Collins-street and to Bourke-street respectively.

A letter was received from Mr. Cowdroy in reference to the valuations the Commission desired him to make, stating that he would be happy to undertake the valuations in question and to give evidence thereon before the Commission; but pointing out that this valuation, &c., was no part of the work for which he received a salary from the Railway Department, and assuming that he was to charge the Commission for it. The Secretary was instructed to ask what his charge would be.

A letter was received from Mr. M. Russell, M.I.C.E., formerly assistant engineer on the N.S.W. railways, offering to submit certain proposals and suggestions formulated by him in regard to the extension of the city westwards. The Secretary was instructed to invite Mr. Russell to attend and give evidence on the following day, 15th instant.

A letter was received from Mr. W. M. Felton, forwarding a sketch of his scheme of city extension.

The following witnesses gave evidence:—Jos. Brady, Esq., Resident Engineer; W. R. Martin, Esq., Engineer Melbourne Harbour Trust, late of the Railway Department; J. O’Malley, Esq., late District Traffic Superintendent Railway Department.

The Secretary was instructed to write to the Hon. Jno. Woods, M.P., and the Hon. Thos. Bent, M.P., asking them to give evidence before the Commission on the 28th and 29th instant, respectively, if convenient.

Adjourned to next day, at Two p.m.
XXX

FRIDAY, 15th APRIL, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, in the Chair;
The Hon. J. A. Wallace, M.L.C., J. H. Widdow, Esq., M.P.,
" N. Thornton, M.L.C., P. Wright, Esq., M.P.,
" W. Malden, M.P., W. Cain, Esq.,
W. Anderson, Esq., M.P., C. Hodgkinson, Esq.,

Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.
The following witnesses gave evidence:—M. Russell, Esq., M.L.C.E.; R. G. Ford, Esq., Engineer of the Public Works Department.
The Secretary was instructed to forward the three plans submitted by Mr. Russell, in illustration of his project of city extension, &c., together with his memorandum in explanation thereof, to the Railway Department, with a request that the Commission may be furnished with a report stating what objections, if any, the Railway Department has to the project.
The Secretary was instructed to see the Hon. W. A. Neal, M.L.C., and to ascertain whether that gentleman was willing to give evidence before the Commission, and if he were prepared with such information as would assist the Commission in its inquiry.
Mr. Alexander, the engineer attached to the Commission, was instructed to prepare a plan showing the extension of Flinders-street, of Latrobe-street, Dudley-street, and of the road across the line at North Melbourne, with grades, &c.
It was determined to recall Mr. Speight towards the end of the inquiry.
Adjourned until 28th instant, at Two p.m.

THURSDAY, 28th APRIL, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, in the Chair;
The Hon. N. Thornton, M.L.C., J. H. Widdow, Esq., M.P.,
" R. Burrows, M.P., P. Wright, Esq., M.P.,
" W. Malden, M.P., W. Cain, Esq.,
W. Anderson, Esq., M.P., J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
G. S. Coppin, Esq., M.P., Clement Hodgkinson, Esq.,
Jno. Laurens, Esq., M.P., A. J. Skene, Esq.,
D. M. Davies, Esq., M.P.,

Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.
A letter was read from Mr. Lunt, Engineer for Existing Lines, stating that he was preparing estimate of cost of removal of Spencer-street Station as desired by the Commission, and would supply it at the earliest date possible.
The Secretary stated that the Railway Commissioners desired him to explain that, in consequence of their having to leave town on a tour of inspection, they were unable to have a report on Mr. M. Russell's project for city extension ready, but it would be supplied by the day following.
A letter was read from the Right Worshipful the Mayor of Melbourne, asking that the following gentlemen be summoned to give evidence before the Commission: — The City Surveyor, A. C. Mountain, Esq., Mr. Wotherspoon, C.E., Alderman O'Grady, and Counsellor Fenwick. The Secretary reported that the first two gentlemen had been summoned to attend on Friday, 28th instant.
A letter was read from Mr. M. Russell, forwarding a number of printed copies, for the use of the members of the Commission, of the synopsis of his proposed dock system for city of Melbourne, and plans for extension of the city westwards, &c., also stating his intention to supply the members of the Commission with lithographic copies of the plans of his project.
The following witnesses were examined:—The Hon. Jno. Woods, M.P., formerly Minister for Railways; W. Tilvalies, Esq., Engineer of Reclamation Works of the Public Works Department.
At the request of the Commission, Mr. Woods consented to appear again next day.
Adjourned to the following day, at Two p.m.

FRIDAY, 29th APRIL, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, in the Chair;
The Hon. Col. F. T. Sargood, M.L.C., Jno. Laurens, Esq., M.P.,
" J. A. Wallace, M.L.C., D. M. Davies, Esq., M.P.,
" N. Thornton, M.L.C., Peter Wight, Esq., M.P.,
" R. Burrows, M.P., W. Cain, Esq.,
" W. Malden, M.P., J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
W. Anderson, Esq., M.P., Clement Hodgkinson, Esq.,
G. S. Coppin, Esq., M.P., A. J. Skene, Esq.,

Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.
The following witnesses were examined:—A. C. Mountain, Esq., M. Inst. C.E., City Surveyor; the Hon. Jno. Woods, recalled: Mr. Wotherspoon, C.E.
The Secretary was instructed to summon Mr. Thos. Walker and another carrier, to give evidence before the Commission.

Mr. Alexander was instructed to ascertain, if possible, for the information of the Commission, the area occupied by some of the principal stations in the United Kingdom, in America, and on the Continent, together with particulars of the character of the traffic at such stations.

Adjourned to Two p.m. on Thursday, 12th May.

THURSDAY, 12TH MAY, 1887.

Members present:


The minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The Secretary read a report from the Railways Commissioners, dated 11th inst., prepared at the request of the Commission, upon the project of Mr. M. Russell, for city extension, &c. The Secretary was instructed to have this report printed as an appendix to the evidence.

A letter, dated 7th instant, was received from Mr. Jno. O'Malley, in regard to the scheme proposed by him for the re-arrangement of the present railway station, &c. A letter was read from Mr. D. Bennet, dated 7th instant, submitting a scheme, with plans, for the extension of the city westward, and for the re-arrangement of the present Spencer-street Station.

A letter was received from the City Council, dated 9th inst., suggesting that the following witnesses be summoned to give evidence:—1. Councillor O. Fenwick; 2. Thomas Walker, Esq., 5a, Queen-street; 3. Captain W. J. Smith; 4. Thos. McPherson, Esq., 147 Collins-street west; 5. A member of the firm of Messrs. Halstead, Kerr, and Co.

Councillor Fenwick was in attendance.

The Secretary reported that Mr. Walker had been summoned for the following day, and the other witnesses would be summoned to attend the meetings of the Commission to be held this day fortnight and the Friday following.

A letter was received from Alderman Thos. O'Grady, dated the 10th instant, stating that he was leaving that evening for Sydney on important private business, and asking that his evidence might be dispensed with, as he had not studied the subject.

The Secretary stated that he had arranged with Mr. Speight, Chairman of the Railways Commissioners, to be re-called, as desired by the Commission, on the 25th instant (Friday).

Mr. Alexander, as the engineer attached to the Commission, submitted certain information collected by him, as desired by the Commission, in regard to the area occupied by some of the principal stations in the United Kingdom. Mr. Alexander was instructed to add to and complete it, as far as he was able, in order that it might be printed as an appendix to the evidence.

The Secretary reported that the estimates and valuation required by the Commission, in pursuance of the minutes of the 1st April, would be ready this day fortnight.

Councillor Fenwick, the only witness present, was examined.

The Secretary was instructed to summon Captain Fullarton, the Chief Harbour Master, to attend as a witness the following day.

He was also instructed to ask the Railways Commissioners to submit for the information of the Commission a plan of their project for station accommodation at Spencer-street, showing also, the purposes to which it is intended to devote the various parts of the railway reserves west of Melbourne.

The Chairman stated that it was intended shortly to close the taking of evidence, and to prepare the report. He would be glad, therefore, if the members of the Commission would furnish the Secretary with the names and addresses of any gentlemen who they desired to have summoned as witnesses.

Adjourned to next day at Two p.m.

FRIDAY 13TH MAY, 1887.

Members present:


Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.

The following witnesses were examined:—Thos. Walker, Esq., carrier; Captain Fullarton, Chief Harbour Master; Mr. R. Hull, carrier.

Adjourned to Thursday, 26th instant, at Two p.m.
THURSDAY, 26th MAY, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair;
N. Thornley, M.L.C., R. Burrowes, Esq., M.P., Peter Wright, Esq., M.P.,
G. S. Coppin, Esq., M.P., G. S. Coppin, Esq., M.P., J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
Jno. Laurans, Esq., M.P., Jno. Laurans, Esq., M.P., Clement Hodgkinson, Esq.,
Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.
The Secretary reported that, in compliance with the request of the City Council, Mr Jno. Andrew, A. J. Skene, Esq.,
of West Melbourne, had been summoned as a witness, and read a letter from that gentleman, dated 25th W. Howard Smith, Esq.,
instance, declining to attend. The Secretary was instructed to inform the Town Clerk accordingly, and J. C. Hatton, Esq., valuer, Railway
to state that it was considered that Mr. Andrew's evidence was essential, steps would be taken to compel department.
his attendance.
A letter was read from Messrs. W. Howard Smith and Sons, Limited, dated 25th instant, stating W. Williams, Esq.; the Railway
that Captain W. H. Smith, who had been summoned as a witness, was now in England. department.
A letter was received from Mr. M. Russell, dated 17th instant, replying to the criticisms of the W. Anderson, Esq., M.P.
Railways Commissioners on his suggestions for station accommodation at Spencer-street and for the extension An anonymous communication, signed "Expediency," was received, submitting a plan for station
of the city westward.
accommodation at Spencer-street and for the extension of the city westward.
The Secretary stated that he had been deputed to ask that the attendance of Mr. Speight might be The following witnesses were examined:—W. Williams, Esq.; J. C. Hatton, Esq., valuer, Railway
excused, on account of his presence being required at the Inquest in connection with the recent railway department.
advent.
The Secretary was instructed to ascertain the cost of cutting down the high land to the north of
La Trobe-street, in order to make it available for railway purposes in the event of Spencer-street station
being moved back to Bourke-street.

Adjourned to next day at Two p.m.

FRIDAY, 27th MAY, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair;
Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.
A letter was received from the Hon. C. J. Han, M.L.C., stating his inability to attend as summoned, and expressing his willingness to attend on another occasion. The following witnesses were examined:—Thos. McPherson, Esq., machinery merchant; A. Kerr, Esq., of Messrs. Haistead and Kerr, timber merchants; A. C. Mountain, Esq., City Surveyor; F. G. Miles, Esq., Town Clerk of South Melbourne; E. Clarke, Esq., of Port Melbourne.
Adjourned to Thursday, 9th June, at Two p.m.

THURSDAY, 16th JUNE, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair;
The Hon. N. Thornley, M.L.C., J. A. Wallace, M.L.C., D. M. Davies, Esq., M.P.,
R. Burrowes, Esq., M.P., W. Anderson, Esq., M.P., J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.P.,
G. S. Coppin, Esq., M.P., Jno. Laurans, Esq., M.P., P. Wright, Esq., M.P.,
Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.
A letter, dated 9th inst., was received from the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce stating that they W. Cain, Esq.,
had no desire to tender any evidence to the Commissioners on the subject of the extension of the city C. Hodgkinson, Esq.,
westwards.
A letter was received from Mr. J. C. Stewart, stating his inability to attend the meeting of the A. J. Skene, Esq.
Commission to-day, on account of business engagements.
A letter, dated 14th instant, was received from the Hon. W. Madden, stating that he had been ordered to New Zealand for a change of scene, and would be on his way when the Commission met; also stating that, in his opinion, Flinders-street, Latrobe-street, Dudley-street, and the North Melbourne bridge, will give all the access required to the docks, and that the railway reserve should not be interfered with.

Mr. Jno. Andrew, of West Melbourne, appeared to explain why he had declined to attend when summoned, and claiming to be examined as a witness now. The Chairman stated that the taking of evidence had been closed, and the preparation of the report was being proceeded with, and consequently his request could not be complied with.

The Chairman submitted a draft report, which was read, discussed, and amended, and the final consideration of it deferred to Wednesday, 6th July, at Eleven a.m.

Adjourner accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, 13TH JULY, 1887.

Members present:
The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair.

The Hon. Col. F. T. Sargood, C.M.G., M.L.C.

J. A. Wallace, M.L.C.

N. Thornley, M.L.C.

Robt. Burrowes, M.P.

W. Madden, M.P.

W. Anderson, Esq., M.P. (Villiers and Heathbury)

G. S. Coppin, Esq., M.P.

John Laurens, Esq., M.P.

D. M. Davies, Esq., M.P.

J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.P.

Peter Wright, Esq., M.P.

W. Cain, Esq.

Clement Hodgkinson, Esq.

A. J. Skene, Esq.

Minutes of previous meeting were read and confirmed.

Preliminary to the consideration of the draft report submitted by the Chairman, Mr. Coppin moved, and Mr. Laurens seconded, "That it would be a great public convenience to extend Collins-street to the docks, and that, in justice to the up-country districts, the land and buildings south of Collins-street should be sold to provide money for the erection of a large station and dock stores connected with the railways."

On the motion being put, it was lost, Messrs. Coppin, Laurens, and Cain voting in favour of it, and Messrs. Tucker, Sargood, Wallace, Thornley, Burrowes, Anderson, Madden, Davies, Wheeler, Hodgkinson, and Skene against it.

Mr. Wright was not present when the vote was taken.

The Chairman then submitted his draft report, which was considered, amended, and finally adopted. The Secretary was instructed to have it prepared for signature.
SYNOPSIS OF EVIDENCE.

Access to the Docks.

FITZGIBBON, E.G.—Report of the Committee of the City Corporation on the subject, to the effect that Flinders-street and Dudley-street would be utterly insufficient, and recommending extension of all the streets from Flinders-street to Bourke-street inclusive, and of La Trobe-street ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ......
Bourke-street, extension of.

| Fitzgibbon, E. G. | Recommended by City Council | 2-3 |
| CAIN, W. | Recommended by City Council | 70, 72, 89 |
| Speight, R. | Bourke-street would not intersect proposed buildings | 292-5, 304-7 |
| Lunt, J. | Graduates involved, cost, &c. | 544-70 |
| | Interference with station buildings | 637-9 |
| Greenz, W. H. | Could be extended, only a question of cost | 773 |
| Watson, R. | Opposed to it | 344-7 |
| Loader, Hon. T. | Should be extended | 964 |
| Russell, M. | Is opposed to it | 1528-30 |
| Fenwick, O. | Approves of it | 2255-6, 2255-6 |
| FULLARTON, Capt. | Not in favour of it | 2456 |
| Martin, W. R. | Opposed to it | 1328-3 |
| Ford, R. G. | Thinks it would be a serious mistake | 1622 |
| Hall, R. | Does not think it necessary | 2489 |
| Feigon, W. M. | Considers it unnecessary to give access to the docks | 1121 |
| Woods, Hon. J. | Not suitable for heavy traffic | 1711 |
| MOUNTAIN, A. C. | Submits plan excising Railway reserve from Bourke-street | 1918-29, 1976-7 |
| MacPherson, T. | Approves of it | 2626 |
| Walker, Thos. | Advocates it | 2344-5 |
| Thwaites, W. | Not in favour of it | 1881 |

City Council's Proposition in regard to Extension of Streets from Bourke-street to Flinders-street inclusive.

Fitzgibbon, E. G. — States particulars of, and of negotiations with Railways Commissioners 1-38, 149-54
Re addition of rateable property to the city by proposed extension | 7, 12 |
Re forming streets if extended | 41-52 |
Cain, W. — States particulars of, and of negotiations with Railways Commissioners | 62-93, 104-42 |
Re addition of rateable property to city by proposed extension | 66-9 |
Re forming streets if extended | 141-2 |
Speight, R. — Particulars of negotiations with City Council, &c. | 162-82 |
Would affect value of Victorian Railways by two or three millions | 228 |
Objections to giving up land south of Collins-street and south of Bourke-street | 207-32, 259-62, 331-5 |
Watson, R. — Opposed to any curtailment of present station reserve | 338-63 |
And to extension of Collins and Bourke streets | 340-80 |
Lunt, J. — Opposed to giving up land south of Collins-street | 613-8 |
Green, W. II. — Land south of Collins-street could not be given up | 675-8 |
Objections to giving up land south of Collins-street and taking Harbour Trust land in lieu thereof | 732-40 |
Extension of Collins-street and of Bourke-street involve gradients of 1 in 24, being governed by position of viaduct as fixed by Act of Parliament | 865-99 |
Loader, Hon. T. — Advocates extension of all streets abutting on Spencer-street station | 900-12, 930-21 |
Brady, J. — Does not think it wise to Government to part with any land between the railway and the docks | 1139-60 |
As to the extension of the city in connexion with the extension of the docks | 1229-42 |
Martin, W. R. — Thinks it would be a mistake to move hack Spencer-street station to Bourke-street | 1317-51 |
And is of opinion that more land will be required in future than is at present appropriated for railway purposes & Spencer-street | 1338-67 |
O'Malley, J. NO. — Advocates carrying streets through from Flinders-street to Bourke-street inclusive, in connexion with his own scheme | 1898-1432, 1443-57, 1482-3 |
Russell, M. — Advocates extension of Collins-street | 1552-67 |
Woods, Hon. J. — Opposed to extension of Collins, Bourke, and La Trobe streets | 1711 |
Objections to proposals of City Council, as set forth by plan submitted by City Surveyor | 2146-2111 |
Mountaine, A. C. — Submits and explains plan illustrating proposals of City Council | 1213-80, 1984-90, 2108-26 |
Submits modified plan in regard to gradients of streets | 2894-69 |
Wotherspoon, R. — Gives particulars of compilation of plan submitted by City Surveyor | 2212-45 |
Fenwick, O. — Advocates extension of Collins, Bourke, La Trobe, Lonsdale, and Dudley streets 2252-6 |
That the Council's proposition would not affect the cost of conveyance of goods | 2279-81 |
Station would be more convenient north of Bourke-street | 2311 |
Walker, Thos. — Advocates extension of Flinders, Collins, and La Trobe streets 2389-39, 2347, 2346-7 |
Hall, R. — Opposed to extension of Collins and Bourke streets, and to parting with any portion of Railway reserve except for widening Flinders street | 2489 |
MACPHERSON, T.—Approves of their proposition to extend Bourke and Collins streets ... 2612-26
MILES, F. G.—Protests on behalf of the City Council of South Melbourne against proposed removal of station northwards ... ... 2827-36
CLARK, E.—Protests on behalf of the Town Council of Port Melbourne against proposed removal of station northwards ... ... 2837-43
HUTTON, J. B.—Valuation of land proposed to be sold ... ... 2544-76
FENWICK, O.—Valuation of land proposed to be sold ... ... 2246, 2282-3

Central Passengers’ Station at Flinders-street, and Goods Station at Spencer-street.

SPEIGHT, R.—Objections to ... ... 188-4, 286-7
GREENE, W. H.—Objections to ... ... 695-6
FERON, W. M.—Was his original proposition ... ... i 135-4
WOODS, Hon. J.—Approves of keeping the suburban apart from the up country traffic ... ... 1675-7

Collins-street, re extension of.

FITZGIBBON, E. G.—Embodied in proposals of the City Council ... ... ... ... ... 2-3
CAIN, W.—Embodied in proposals of the City Council ... ... ... ... ... 79-89
SPEIGHT, R.—Objections to ... ... ... ... ... 173-9, 290-303
Does not see what access it would give to the docks ... ... ... ... ... 207
Crossing on the level would necessitate taking railway property, which Commissioners cannot afford to part with ... ... ... ... ... 210-12
Considers it would be impolitic to cut off the railway land south of Collins-street ... ... ... ... ... 267-84
WATSON, R.—Opposed to it ... ... ... ... ... 341-79
LUNT, J.—Gradients involved and cost. Improbability of its being used for heavy traffic ... ... ... ... ... 42-543
Interferes with proposed railway offices and present station buildings ... ... ... ... ... 634-6, 640
GREENE, W. H.—Would necessitate abandoning proposed scheme of rearrangement of the station ... ... ... ... ... 695-4, 697-717
Prepared a plan showing extension of Collins-street at its present level merely to show that it could be done, but points out fatal objection to such a course ... ... ... ... ... 747-58
As to gradient involved in proposed extension. Does not consider it would be used for heavy traffic ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 812-825A
Submits plan of extension prepared by him; status gradient involved ... ... ... ... ... 827-68
LOADER, Hon. T.—In favour of extension ... ... ... ... ... 904, 913-1021
BRADY, Jos.—Is opposed to it ... ... ... ... ... 1227-30
MARTIN, W. R.—Does not think it would be wise to divert heavy traffic into Collins-street if extended ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 1385-7
O’MALLEY, Jos. ... ... ... ... ... 1445-57
RUSSELL, M.—Embodies extension in his scheme ... ... ... ... ... 1528-39
FORD, R. G.—Thinks it would be a serious mistake ... ... ... ... ... 1622
WOODS, Hon. J.—Would not be suitable for heavy traffic ... ... ... ... ... 1711, 1741-59, 1766-79, 1791-5
THWAITES, W.—Must be very expensive, and it is a question whether the game is worth the candle ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 1881-3
MOUNTAIN, A. C.—Embodied in plan submitted by him ... ... ... ... ... 1919-29
WALKER, R.—Advocates it ... ... ... ... ... 2445-7
MACPHERSON, T.—Advocates it ... ... ... ... ... 2626, 2687-94
HALL, R.—Does not think it would be necessary to extend Collins-street or Bourke-street ... ... ... ... ... 2489
KERR, A.—Opposed to it ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 2793
FENWICK, O.—Advocates it ... ... ... ... ... 2255-6, 2292-6
FULLARTON, Capt.—That traffic would go along La Trobe-street or Flinders-street in preference to Collins and Bourke streets if continued ... ... ... ... ... 2456
RUSSELL, M.—Approves of extension of Collins-street and curtailing Railway reserve south thereof, but does not approve of extension of Bourke-street ... ... ... ... ... 1528-30
THWAITES, W.—Is not in favour of the extension of Bourke and Collins streets ... ... ... ... ... 1881
WOODS, Hon. J.—Opposed to any curtailment of the Railway reserve, and to extension of Collins-street ... ... ... ... ... 1665-70

Conveyance of Goods, as to Cost of, affected by proposed Alteration in Site of Station.

FENWICK, O.—No increase by putting goods-shed half-a-mile further to the north ... ... 2274-81, 2284-98, 2310-24
WALKER, T.—No material increase by putting goods-shed half-a-mile further to the north ... ... 2253-24, 2403-11
HALL, R.—Considers cost of carriage of goods would be increased by putting goods-sheds further north ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... 2479-83
MACPHERSON, T.—Does not consider any increased cost of goods would result from removal of station ... 2037-30, 2863-6, 59-271, 2725-79

KERR, A.—Half-a-mile extra carriage would cost $6. per ton. Within a certain radius changes per ton are the same ... 2793-7, 2868-92

MILES, F. G.—Would entail a higher price for carriage of goods and passengers ... 2833

CLARK, E.—Would entail a higher price for carriage of goods and passengers ... 2840-2

Crown Lands to the west and north-west of the docks coloured "yellow" on Plans submitted to the Commissioners, re access thereto, &c.

CAIN, W.—Council desire to have access thereto ... 80-93

SPEIGHT, R.—Considers Dudley-street would give great access thereto ... 329-30

Would like to keep this land for railway purposes ... 293

LUNT, J.—Access by the river, by Dudley-street, and by North Melbourne Bridge. Access blocked in one direction by land now being utilized for coal stages ... 597-612, 633-70

GREENE, W. H.—Access by the river, by Dudley-street, and by North Melbourne Bridge. Access blocked in one direction by land now being utilized for coal stages ... 784-99

LOADER, Hon. T.—Points out difficulty of access to ... 921

FEHON, W. M.—Points out that these lands are isolated unless access provided by extension of streets across the railway ... 1120-46

MARTIN, W. R.—Thinks they will be ultimately required for railway and dock purposes; access by Dudley and Flinders streets ... 1371-1384

FORD, R. G.—Access by Flinders and Dudley streets ... 1633-39, 1650-7

WOODS, Hon. J.—Access by Flinders and Dudley streets ... 1688-92, 1760-3, 1780-2

MOUNTAIN, A. C.—Considers traffic from these lands would come by Collins-street if extended in preference to La Trobe street ... 2092-2107

Dudley-street, North Melbourne Bridge, and La Trobe-street would give direct access to these lands, but advocates extension of other streets as well ... 2859-60

FULLARTON, Capt. R.—Access by La Trobe and Dudley streets ... 2454

Dudley-street, extension of.

FITZGIBBON, E. G.—City Council consider it unfit in its present state for anything else but pedestrians ... 2-3, 34-9

SPEIGHT, R.—Could be made a first-class approach to the docks, &c. ... 329-30

WATSON, R.—Considers that with Flinders-street it would give sufficient access to the docks ... 354-71

LUNT, J.—Could be improved. With La Trobe-street and Flinders-street would give good access to the docks ... 422, 640-50

Graduate is a heavy one ... 657, 667-70

GREENE, W. H.—Commissioners have already had under consideration the improvement of this street ... 741-6

BRADY, Jos.—Considers it should be made a main artery of traffic ... 1243-68

MARTIN, W. R.—Suggests the improvement of the crossing at ... 1380

WOODS, Hon. J.—Considers heavy traffic would evade this route ... 1689, 1836-88, 1713-6

THWAITES, W.—Would give good access to the docks, &c. ... 1877

WALKER, Thos.—La Trobe-street would be used in preference to it ... 2413-4

Extension of the City Westwards by extension of Streets across the Railway.

FENWICK, O.—Advocates extension of Collins and Bourke streets ... 2255-6

MACPHERSON, T.—Approves of carrying station back beyond Bourke-street, and extending both Collins and Bourke streets ... 2619-26, 2632

WALKER, T.—Is in favour of extension of both Collins and Bourke streets 2292, 2291, 2288, 2435-7, 2453

FULLARCTON, Capt.—Does not think that any part of the railway could be disposed of; and that traffic would go by Flinders-street and La Trobe-street in preference to Collins-street at Bourke-street ... 2466

HALL, R.—Thinks it would be great folly to carry Collins-street through ... 2793, 2798

FITZGIBBON, E. G.—Re action of the City Corporation in the matter ... 2

CAIN, W.—Re negotiations with Railways Commissioners ... 104-36

SPEIGHT, R.—Does not think that the land south of the alignment of Bourke-streets, if produced across the railway, is worth more to anybody than the Railway Department ... 180-2

WATSON, R.—Is opposed to extension of Bourke and Collins streets ... 344-79

LUNT, J.—Is opposed to extension of Bourke and Collins streets ... 391-7

GREENE, W. H.—Does not think Railway Department could give up any of its land for extending streets of Melbourne except for Flinders-street ... 675-8, 716-7
FEHON, W. M.—Is opposed to extension of Bourke and Collins streets 1121
LOADER, Hon. T.—In favour of extending all streets abutting on Spencer-street station 900-15, 920-21
BRAKY, J.—Is of opinion that "Extension of City Westwards" is to extend the city to the docks 1159
Consiiders Flinders-street would give best access thereto, then La Trobe-street, Dudley-street, and North Melbourne Bridge 1245
MARTIN, W. R.—Opposed to extension of Bourke and Collins street by contracting Railway reserve 1320-3
FORD, R. G.—Thinks it would be a very serious mistake to extend Bourke-street or Collins-street 1622
HALL, R.—Does not think it necessary to extend Bourke-street or Collins-street 2489
MOUNTAIN, A. C.—Submits plan cutting off Railway reserve from Bourke-street 1913-77

Fehon's, Mr. W. M., proposals.
SPEIGHT, R.—Objects to them 310-13
WATSON, R. 347-8
FEHON, Wm.—Describes them 1029-1117

Firewood and Timber Traffic, Accommodation for.
FITZGIBBON, E. G.—City Council's Committee refer to its occupying valuable land 2
SPEIGHT, R.—In proposed re-arrangement of station area applied to, to be reduced 229, 248-53
LUNT, J.—Considers the accommodation necessary 400-12
WOODS, Hon. J.—Considers the accommodation necessary 1670-3
WALKER, Thos.—Considers it unnecessary, and that the timber should be unloaded in the suburbs 2386-93

Flinders-street, extension and widening of.
FITZGIBBON, E. G.—Negotiations between Harbour Trust, Railway Department, and City Council in regard to 2, 16
CAIN, W.—Negotiations between Harbour Trust, Railway Department, and City Council in regard to 137
SPEIGHT, R.—Negotiations between Harbour Trust, Railway Department, and City Council in regard to 162-69, 321
Considers that for a long time to come Flinders-street would give sufficient access to the docks 207-15, 263-5, 321-9
Gas Company's property in the way 337
WATSON, R.—Considers that extension of Flinders-street and Dudley-street would give sufficient access to the docks 329, 348, 352, 354-8, 364
GREENE, W. H.—Re curving Flinders-street to connect with the docks 800-1
Considers heavy traffic would go along Flinders-street even if Collins-street were extended 824, 826a
LOADEE, Hon. T.—Does not think that Flinders-street widened would give sufficient access to the docks 229, 333, 947-9, 960-68, 391
BRADY, Jos.—Considers Flinders-street is the best mode of access to the docks and sufficient 1160-85, 1195-1212, 1243, 1269-97
RUSSELL, M.—Approves of its extension 1513-6
WOODS, Hon. J.—Is of opinion that for many years to come Flinders-street, if widened as proposed, will be amply sufficient for the heavy traffic in connexion with the docks 1717-34
THWAITES, W.—Considers Flinders-street should be carried through at its present width and upon its present lines 1875-6
MOUNTAIN, A. C.—Approves of its extension 1981, 1983-2600, 2066-91
WOTHERSPOON, R.—Would give easiest route to docks 2222-5
WALKER, Thos.—Considers it would be most important to widen and extend it 2332, 2420-25
FULLARTON, Captain R.—Advocates it 2452, 2456, 2497
HALL, R.—Considers it would be the principal means of access to the docks 2484, 2488

Flinders-street Viaduct to connect Spencer-street Station with Flinders-street Station.
FEHON, W. M.—Approves of it 1116-7, 1152
O'MALLEY, Jno.—Considers it unnecessary 1408-9, 1433-44, 1457-78
RUSSELL, M.—Approves of it 1538-40
FORD, R. G.—Considers it a vital necessity 1614-5
La Trobe-street, extension of.

FITZGIBBON, E. G.—It has always been understood there should be a viaduct at ... ... ... 28
CAIN, W.—Viaduct proposal ... ... ... ... ... 74, 114-5
SPEIGHT, R.—Viaduct could be provided if required ... ... ... ... 290-6
LUNT, J.—Gradient, cost, &c. ... ... ... ... ... 622-34
   Would give better access to West Melbourne Swamp than Lonsdale, Bourke, or Collins streets ... ... ... ... ... 643-4
GREENE, W. H.—Least objectionable in comparison with Bourke and Collins streets extension, and would give better access to docks ... ... ... ... ... 709-14
LOADER, Hon. T.—In favour of the extension, but prefers Collins-street extension 930, 938, 244, 964-7, 991, 994-7, 1018-20
BRADY, J.—Thinks La Trobe-street might be carried through with very great advantage 1157-8, 1189-93
MARTIN, W. E.—Approves of the extension ... ... ... ... ... 1888-94
RUSSELL, M.—Approves of the extension ... ... ... ... ... 1530-2
FORD, R. G.—Opposed to it. Considers the grade too heavy; and, besides, the terminus should be kept clear of any such obstruction ... ... ... ... ... 1619-24
WOODS, Hon. J.—Not suitable for heavy traffic ... ... ... ... ... 1711-36
   Considers it would obstruct the view in station yard ... ... ... ... ... 1829-34, 1846-51
THWAITES, W.—Advocates it ... ... ... ... ... 1876-7, 1881-4
MOUNTAIN, A. C.—Does not think there would be any practical advantage in it 1965-7, 2134-45
WALKER, Thos.—Thinks it will give easiest route to the north from dock 2380-81, 2413-4, 2436-41
HALL, R.—Considers traffic would take this road or Dudley-street, next to Flinders-street, in preference to Bourke or Collins streets ... ... ... ... ... 2485, 2496
KERR, A.—Thinks it would be of the greatest advantage to the public ... ... ... ... ... 2802-7, 2825-6

Lonsdale-street, extension of.

LUNT, J.—Gradient, cost, &c. ... ... ... ... ... 618-621
LOADER, Hon. T.—Advocates its extension ... ... ... ... ... 905, 964

Purchase of High Ground to East of Railway Reserve necessary if Station removed North of Bourke-street.

SPEIGHT, R.—Corresponding area would be required to what might be taken ... ... ... ... 229-38
GREENE, W. H.—Corresponding area would be required to what might be taken ... ... ... ... 687-707
FEHON, W. M.—Would advocate taking Harbour Trust land instead ... ... ... ... ... 1150
HUTTON, J. B.—Valuation of ... ... ... ... ... 2577-2607

Suitability of West Melbourne Swamp Land for Building Purposes.

FITZGIBBON, E. G.—Considers there would be no difficulty in the matter, and refers to San Francisco ... ... ... ... ... ... 40
CAIN, W.—Refers to the practice in Amsterdam and Rotterdam of building on sand, and considers no difficulty in the matter ... ... ... ... ... ... 91-108
FEHON, W. M.—Considers that sand concrete would answer as foundations ... ... ... ... ... ... 1081-93
   Refers to Chicago, San Francisco, and St. Petersburg ... ... ... ... ... ... 1105-11
MARTIN, W. R.—Considers foundations very bad and expensive, and ground unhealthy ... ... ... ... ... ... 1368
FORD, R. G.—Does not think building would be expensive on the Swamp, and would encourage people to build there ... ... ... ... ... ... 1494-49
WOODS, Hon. J.—Thinks building would be a very simple process, and refers to the character of the filling taken out of his dock ... ... ... ... ... ... 1694-8
THWAITES, W.—Considers the ground would be suitable for erection of warehouses on a very large scale, and cites Chicago, Port Adelaide, and along the East River at New York ... ... ... ... ... ... 1895A-6

New Steam Ferry across the Yarra near Gasworks.

WALKER, Thos.—Proposed that ferry be provided ... ... ... ... ... ... 2355-7, 2418-4
HALL, R.—In favour of it ... ... ... ... ... ... 2498-2507
KERR, A.—In favour of it ... ... ... ... ... ... 2790-8
Spencer-street Station, Area required for Railway Purposes, proposed re-arrangement of, &c.

SPIGHT, R.—Ratio of increase in traffic necessitates adequate provision for extension of station accommodation ... ... ... ... ... 185-200
Recent reservation of land is connexion with ... ... ... ... ... 201-3
Necessity of retaining all the land at Spencer-street station for railway purposes ... 204-6, 228, 288
Proposed re-arrangement of station ... ... ... ... ... 233-55
Reservations of land at ... ... ... ... ... 316-20
LUNT, J.—Land now reserved all required for railway purposes ... ... ... 579-82
Proposed re-arrangement of station ... ... ... ... ... 585-90
GREENE, W. H.—Land now reserved all required for railway purposes ... ... ... 679-92
Proposed re-arrangement of station ... ... ... ... ... 718-31
LOADER, Hon. T.—Advocates extension of all streets abutting thereon ... ... ... 905
BRADY, Jos.—Does not consider it advisable for department to give up any land at Spencer-street ... ... ... ... ... 1157, 1160, 1308-18
MARTIN, W. R.—In favour of the reserve being left intact ... ... ... ... ... 1317-34
RUSSELL, M.—Re proposals of Railway Department for re-arrangement of station ... ... ... 1379-81
FORD, R. G.—Is of opinion that present reserve should be left intact ... ... ... 1397-9, 1699-42
WOODS, Hon. J.—Is of opinion that present reserve should be left intact ... ... ... 1669-70
Re proposals of Railway Commissioners for re-arrangement of station ... ... ... 1738-40
Necessity to concentrate business at a terminal station ... ... ... ... ... 1852-69
MOUNTAIN, A. C.—Re size of Cannon-street station, London, as compared with Spencer-street ... ... ... ... ... 2042-55, 2108, 2127-31
FENWICK, O.—Advocates moving station back to Londsdale-street ... 2265-78, 2299-302, 2325-59
WALKER, Thos.—Would not sell any part of the railway reserve, although in favour of extending the streets across it. Is of opinion that goods station be placed across the eastern end of the quays ... ... ... ... ... 2258-77, 2429-34
Considers it unnecessary to bring timber, &c., to Spencer-street, to be carted back to suburbs.
Four or five depots in the suburbs would be more serviceable than one large depot at Spencer-street ... ... ... ... ... 2385-92
FULLARTON, Captain R.—Does not think that any part of it should be disposed of ... 2435, 2437
Considers that the whole of the West Melbourne Swamp should be kept for railway and dock purposes ... ... ... ... ... 2460-63
HALL, R.—In favour of the reserve being left intact ... ... ... ... ... 2489-95
MACPHERSON, T.—Does not agree with the proposition to keep the whole of the West Melbourne Swamp for railway and dock purposes ... ... ... ... ... 2638
 Does not consider it necessary to retain the whole of the present station ground ... ... ... 2662-74
KERR, A.—Considers it should be left intact ... ... ... ... ... 2790, 2799
HUTTON, J. R.—Valuation of land proposed to be sold by City Council ... ... ... 2554-76, 2608-11
FENWICK, O.—Valuation of land proposed to be sold by City Council ... ... ... 2246, 2282-3
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ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE EXTENSION OF MELBOURNE WESTWARD.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

THURSDAY, 17th MARCH, 1887.

The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.L.A., in the Chair;

" J. A. Wallace, M.L.C., P. Wright, Esq., M.L.A.,
" N. Thorley, M.L.C., W. Cain, Esq.,
" W. Maddon, M.L.A., J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
G. S. Coppin, Esq., M.L.A., C. Hodgkinson, Esq.,

Edmund Gerald FitzGibbon, Esq., Town Clerk of the City of Melbourne, examined.

1. By the Commission.—Will you produce any resolution of the City Council of Melbourne on the subject of the extension of the city westward? — I have the honour to place before the Commission the resolutions adopted by the City Council on the 14th of June, 1886, the 12th of July, 1886, and the 13th of December, 1886. They are taken from the printed minutes of the council, and I have copies of them here. If it be desired by the Commission, I will read them.

2. If you please? — On the 14th of June, 1886, a report of the Public Works Committee, No. 59, was presented, recommending—"That a communication be forwarded to the Commissioners of Harbour Trust, asking to be informed what would be the extra cost of depositing silt upon the West Melbourne Swamp, instead of depositing it in the Bay." That, however, was only indirectly relating to the matter. Then, at the same meeting, a report of the same Committee, No. 90, was presented, recommending—"That a deputation from this Council be appointed to wait upon the Honorable the Premier, to urge that in any railway or other works or improvements now in contemplation at, or in connexion with the Spencer-street Station or the West Melbourne Swamp, provision may be made for the continuation of the main east and west streets of the city through and across the railway, so as to provide for the further extension of the city westward." That report was adopted, and the committee ordered and directed to inspect the locality, and report specially upon the subject, prior to such deputation waiting upon the Premier. On the 13th July, the subsequent month, "The report of the Public Works Committee, No. 102, was presented to the Council, submitting the report of the sub-committee appointed to consider and report as to the extension of streets to the proposed docks in the West Melbourne Swamp, and recommending adoption of the same; and that thereupon it be furnished to the Executive Government, the Railway Commissioners, and the Commissioners of the Melbourne Harbour Trust, and that such further action as may be deemed expedient be taken for accomplishment of its object." Such report was adopted, and it was resolved further that communications be at once opened with the Harbour Trust and Chamber of Commerce, inviting joint representation of those bodies in support of the resolution now adopted, at the interview which has been determined upon with the Honorable the Premier. The sub-committee's report, which is referred to there, was as follows:—"Your sub-committee have the honour to report that they have inspected all available plans of the lands now occupied by the Railway Commissioners, of those vested in the Harbour Trust for dock purposes, and of the Crown lands bounded by the Yarra and the Saltwater rivers, and together with the Mayor, the Town Clerk, and the City Surveyor, have visited the locality. The result of this inspection and visit was to show that the only means of access provided to the proposed site of 213 acres for docks would be by the extension of Flinders and Dudley streets; and to the northern portion of the Crown lands by the present road to the Saltwater river, which crosses the railway at the North Melbourne Station. As to these, Flinders-street is quite inadequate to accommodate, with safety, any great increase of its present traffic, and under no circumstances would it be advisable to attempt to carry, by means of it, the enormous traffic that will need to be provided for in connexion with the North Wharf extensions and the proposed docks. As to Dudley-street, it is totally unfitted for other traffic than foot passengers or stock. It passes under the railway in a similar manner to the culvert near North Melbourne station, which is about being abandoned for the new over-bridge. And as to the road over this bridge, it skirts the boundary of the lands recently gazetted as temporarily reserved for railway purposes, is too narrow, and leads in a different direction from the proposed docks. It is therefore apparent to the Committee that only Flinders-street and Dudley-street can be looked upon as approaches to the docks, and it is manifest that these are utterly insufficient for the certain requirements of the dock traffic and that it will be a calamity to the commerce of Melbourne, and to the interests of the whole colony, if greater accommodation is not provided by an extension of certain streets which now have their termination at Spencer-street, and that before any further permanent buildings are erected on the lands now occupied by the Railway Commissioners, provision should be made for such extensions. The Committee are of opinion that Flinders-street
should be at once widened and extended to the river bank; that provision should be made for the extension of all the streets from Flinders-street to Bourke-street inclusive; that Latrobe-street should pass over the railway by a viaduct; and that, to carry out these extensions, the railway station yards for passengers and goods might be kept north of the extension of Bourke-street, communication with the Flinders-street Station being provided for by a viaduct passing over these extensions. The Committee do not close their eyes to the magnitude of the interests involved; they submit that the paramount object is to provide for access to the docks and shipping. To accomplish this, a large area of valuable lands, now occupied as firewood and timber yards, could be made available. The value of these lands is enormous, and would more than repay any possible outlay. The purposes for which these lands are now used would be equally well served on less valuable land to the north of the present and suggested station. But provision for the commerce of the city is all important, and if not now made cannot be provided for if permanent and felicitous results are to be had in the metropolis carried out at the present Melbourne station. That is the report which was adopted by the City Council on the 12th July. In accordance with the Council's resolution, an interview was had with the Honorable the Premier, the principal point of which was to impress upon his Excellency the Prime Minister the importance of the matter to the commerce of the city, and that the railway is an essential part of the necessary improvements to be made. The Committee was, in consequence, instructed to proceed with the necessary arrangements for the purchase of the property, and the line of road was opened for the consideration of the Council.

3. Does the City Council then propose that all the streets between Flinders-street and Dudley-street should be projected across the present railway line?—No; the resolution of the City Council, which you will find on the 14th of June last, restricted itself to the area, as stated in the Report which I have here to read just now. “The Committee are of opinion that Flinders-street should be at once widened and extended to the river bank; that provision should be made for the extension of all the streets from Flinders-street to Bourke-street inclusive; that Latrobe-street should pass over the railway by a viaduct; and that, to carry out these extensions the railway station yards for passengers and goods might be kept north of the extension of Bourke-street, communication with the Flinders-street Station being provided for by a viaduct.” There is a roadway under Dudley-street, and it would be for engineering skill to decide how far that can be improved upon and made available. At present it is scarcely such a roadway as would serve traffic, and there is a roadway over the North Melbourne bridge.

4. It really means the extension of all the streets except Lonsdale-street, Little Lonsdale-street, and Bourke-street?—There are a number of other streets.

5. I speak of those immediately over the station ground?—North of Bourke-street is Little Bourke-street, which street, and Lonsdale-street, and Little Lonsdale-street, and so on, it is not proposed to extend.

6. Has the Council been in communication with the Railway Department upon the matter?—Yes, there was an interview between the Commissioners of Railways and His Worship the Mayor (at that time Alderman Stewart) upon the matter. On the 21st of September last, a conversation took place between the Railway Commissioners and members of the City Council upon the subject.

7. Did the Committee go into the matter as to the addition to the rateable property of the city that would be obtained by extending these streets?—As far as the City Council of Melbourne is concerned, that is the last consideration they would deal with. They are not actuated by the question of rating in any way.

8. I simply ask whether that has been taken into consideration?—No.

9. It has not.—No.

10. Do you know what area of the land would be absorbed by these extensions?—As far as my acquaintance with the plans is concerned, the West Melbourne Swamp is said to contain 790 acres. It is a very much smaller area than that of the swamp!—Yes.

11. You have no ground prepared for buildings purposes, to be used for building purposes, or for the extension of the streets?—I suppose that about 50 or 60 acres would be the land south of Bourke-street, but the land westward of the portion here tinted pink would run, I suppose, to 350 acres.

12. Then, when you were communicated with by the Harbour Trust, the Council declined to undertake any expenditure in carrying out this project?—Clearly.

13. Out of course the Council would take the responsibility of forming all streets and raising them to the proper level, and so on?—The Council would deal with those in the same way as they deal with Crown lands laid off for sale. The Crown lands of the colony are the property of the State, and the State decides what land it will lay off as streets and roads, and, provided the streets are not less than the legal width—66 feet—-the City Council accepts the responsibility, and makes those streets. In a case of this kind, where an enormous amount of money is to be obtained out of it (I only speak for myself now, as a matter of policy), I do not know whether, as a matter of policy, out of the large amount of money to be got, the streets might not be handed over ready made for maintenance.

14. I understood that the City Council had almost arrived at a conclusion upon this matter?—Upon what matter?

15. The extension of the streets?—There were conferences upon the extension of Flinders-street westward, and it was pointed out by the Commissioners that, to so extend Flinders-street, would require the removal of certain sheds. One of those is only a corrugated iron one; there is a brick shed, but only a very small portion of it would be affected by extending Flinders-street west. There was an opinion definitely in favour of the extension of Flinders-street westward, but it was a question with the Commissioners of Railways as to the cost of pulling down their buildings.

16. There was no negotiation about the extension of Collins-street at all with the Railway Commissioners?—We are talking about two different matters, and two interviews. At the more recent interview,
upon the 21st of September last, which arose out of the resolutions of the City Council which I have just read, and out of the communications with the Premier thereupon, there was a conversation as to the extension of Collins-street. The Commissioners appeared to be of opinion that Collins-street might, without difficulty, be extended westward. The matter of doubt, as between the Commissioners and the representatives of the City Council at that interview was, as to whether the extensions should terminate at Collins-street, and as to whether or not Bourke-street might be extended; the judgment of the Commissioners being, I think, that Collins-street was the only extension, and that they were disinclined to go the length of extending Bourke-street.

18. Was any plan compiled by the surveyor of the City Council showing the proposed extensions?—Not by authority; there is no authorized plan of the City Council. The surveyor and I have had conversations in regard to what might be done, but these were only personal speculations as to possibilities. We were not attempting to dictate as to what might be done.

19. No plan was prepared, then, to the Railway Commissioners at all by the Council?—The Council had no authorized plan prepared.

20. Had they any plan at all?—Yes, we had the plans sent down by the Lands Department, of which, I think, I have a copy here, showing the amount of land and the manner in which the land was proposed to be disposed of. Here is the plan, which I received from the Lands Department.

21. What the chairman wants to ascertain is this:—Was there any plan produced at the interview between the Railway Commissioners and the representatives of the Council, in which the streets were marked across in my room, when I was mayor?—I do not remember the production of any plan. The communications which I received from the Railway Commissioners said that the engineer would attend with plans. There were a number of plans from the Railway Department, but not any plans prepared by us.

22. Del the Railway Commissioners state or put forward this proposition:—That the Council ought to bear some of the expense of moving those buildings?—I have no clear recollection as to their making such a statement, but such a statement, I would not attach much importance to, because that is a matter of policy that would not lie with the Railway Commissioners.

23. May I ask how far the city extends westwards?—To about half a mile beyond the gas works.

24. Then the whole of the Harbour Trust lands and railway reserve lands are within the city?—No, part of them. I cannot tell you exactly how it stands. The railway produced and explained the plan. The land reserved for the railways and part of the docks overlap the city; in fact, the entrance to the dock is without the city.

25. At any rate, all the land affected by this proposition is within the city of Melbourne?—Not the land constituting what is called West Melbourne Swamp.

26. But all the land immediately affected by the proposal lies within the city boundaries?—The prolongation of Bourke-street, if prolonged, of Collins-street, and the streets south of Bourke-street, will be within the area of the City Council's municipal limits.

27. What I wanted to see this plan for is, that it seems here if Collins-street were produced in a straight line it would certainly not give access to the new docks at all, but would run full hilt upon the gas works?—No doubt; but at the same time there are streets diverging northwards from there, and those diverging streets would give access to the docks, and would relieve the only access the docks have at present from the river.

28. Was the extension of La Trobe-street brought before the Commissioners?—Yes, the proposition to bridge La Trobe-street over, that has always been understood, to bridge over the railway lines from La Trobe-street; the street is at a high level, and there is no difficulty in carrying a bridge across there.

29. Then the sum of it all is, that the Council advocate this extension, taking upon it no other burden or liability than that of making the streets necessitated by the extension?—Exactly. The liability that falls upon the municipal body when it accepts its charge will be to accept the streets laid off by the Crown and deal with them according to law.

30. Without making any compensation?—What have the city to make compensation for? 31. I merely ask that, if all those stations have to be pulled down by all these extensions, the city does so provide for the compensation for it?—If the State were willing enough to give the fee of the adjacent land to the city, the city would be willing to pull down the stations and build palatial stations instead of them, and to put a very handsome amount of money into its pocket.

32. As regards the municipal area, I would like to ask you somewhat speculative question; in the event of municipal control having to be given to the area beyond the present western limits of the corporation of Melbourne, would it be added, likely, to the present area?—I think I can speak for the City Council, and as far as I can speak for it I have no hesitation in saying that the City Council is entirely indifferent as to what municipal control it may be assigned to. A portion of this area at the present time is nominally assigned to the municipality of Footscray. If the aggregate wisdom of the Legislature or Her Majesty's Government pleases to assign the whole to Footscray, the city of Melbourne has no selfish purposes of its own to put in the matter. And so, as to that, or may say, if the City Council's object had been rates, the City Council for the last thirty years would have been obtaining rates from the land which the City Council has kept open and free for railway use in Flinders-street. In the year 1855 Captain Clarke, then Surveyor-General, in opposition to the protest of the City Council, let on lease the land, which is between the roadway of Flinders-street and the River Yarra. The City Council protested against it, and prevented the renewal of those leases, the City Council then wisely and providently having in view that the time would come when the whole of that land would be needed for the connection of the railway lines. If the City Council had allowed it to be sold, the Council would have been getting a magnificent revenue from the enormously valuable lands along Flinders-street. It ignored that in view of the immense advantage that would accrue to the State, and which is accruing to the colony at the present time, as the land is available for the viaduct now without a penny of compensation being paid to anybody, and the City Council's fiscal interest is to sell it at the highest possible price.

33. My object was simply to elicit your opinion whether the City of Melbourne is not the most proper corporation to take the charge and the control, in a municipal sense, if control be needed, of an extended area?—I think I may say this, and I say it without hesitation, that the City Council will be
quite content to abide, in regard to that, whatever judgment may be come to, and will not express an opinion upon the subject.

34. All the extensions, I understand, that your Council is prepared to advocate, really do pass over land at present within the city of Melbourne?—Bourke-streets and the streets south of it are all within the city of Melbourne. Dudley-street, for the greater portion of its length, will be within the city of Melbourne; the street over North Melbourne bridge will be only for a very short portion of its length in the city of Melbourne.

35. What is the reason in your mind for believing that that street is not compatible with a large amount of traffic?—The condition of things at Dudley street at the present time—the levels, the condition of things which has existed so many years, and has necessitated the building of a bridge overhead at North Melbourne, near North Melbourne Station; the only passage through was by the culvert, and it was culvert which, as well as my judgment enabled me to give an opinion, was a higher and better culvert than that under Dudley-street, and even to get through at the North Melbourne Station it was necessary that an excavation should be made. It was a mud-hole during the wet weather, and Dudley-street is in the same condition at the present time. The level of the railway is to a great extent fixed—I suppose absolutely fixed—by the permanent building of the North Melbourne Station bridge, and it is so low that as the levels are at the present time, it is quite out of possibility to make headway under that.

36. Upon the other hand, you believe that it is practicable to make a road over, such as is being done at North Melbourne?—As far as that is concerned, I guard myself. I am not an engineer in any sense, and therefore would not offer an opinion upon the possibility of making a road over, for though it may be possible to make a road under (but it does not seem to me so), under any circumstances it would be a make-shift, and a very poor one for traffic, and would not carry the description of goods that it seems to me well calculated for from the docks.

37. At North Melbourne it meets immediately with a high level; it would make a low level on this side.—A very low level.

38. Is Dudley-street proclaimed right through, do you know?—No, I think that Dudley-street stops, and is not proclaimed further than Alderley-street, or one of those streets.

39. There are buildings upon Alderley-street?—I do not think that Dudley-street is proclaimed beyond the railway.

40. Has the City Council at any time deputed its professional officer so ascertain by borings or other means the nature of the strata in the swamp, to see how far it can be made available for building purposes?—No, as far as building purposes, seeing the description of buildings that have been put up and the description of lands built upon in other places, and seeing how large a portion of San Francisco, for instance, is built upon a reclaimed portion of the bay, and the very ships themselves built into it, and that the land so made is built upon, I do not apprehend that, as far as building upon West Melbourne is concerned, it would at all surpass engineering ability to put whatever structures might be necessary upon it.

41. It appears that the only rateable property of great size upon this area is occupied by the Melbourne Gas Works and Williams's carriage factory?—Yes, we obtain no rates west of the railway.

42. Do you not get rates from the gas works?—From the gas works; and I say, no other works west of the railway, that I remember.

43. I think there is a street by the side of the gas works, is that proclaimed?—I do not know whether it is or not.

44. Is not that a street falling under the jurisdiction of the City Council with liability to make it?—With liability to make it.

45. You said that the Council accepted the liability to make all streets laid off by Government?—As to the liability, there is a judgment and discretion on the part of the City Council. The City Council has not come to that happy period yet, when its purse is Fortunatus's, and it can make every street in Melbourne that requires to be made; there remains with the Council a discretion and judgment as to what really requires most attention, and where expenditure shall be.

46. I point out this particular street that appears upon the plan, and has appeared, for many years past. It is bounded from which the city rates extend, and is the only mode of access to another property, which, I presume, also pays rates, and the City Council, in its discretion, has not made that street. Might it not also, in the exercise of its discretion and judgment, looking at the enormous cost of making those other streets, decide also to keep those streets in a state of nature?—As far as the property abutting upon that street is concerned, there is a portion of it which pays no rates at all to the city, although the traffic from those allotments runs up the streets of the city heavily. You bear in mind that the Railway Commissioners have guarded themselves in the Act against being rated, and though they let land to tenants, no rates come to the City Council.

47. And a very grave mistake?—A very great mistake; and what is more, a great wrong to the city. A gentleman, a timber merchant in extensive business, has taken advantage of the Act of Parliament to pay no rates whatever. One side of the street is occupied, as far as my knowledge goes, wholly by tenants who pay no rates; and, except as far as those people are concerned, the street is absolutely unnecessary to the mass of the ratepayers of Melbourne.

48. But it is necessary to get to Williams's carriage works?—As far as Williams's carriage works are concerned; not every ratepayer in Melbourne can have a road made to his door.

49. I allude to this street to ask this question:—Whether, if the Commission think fit to recommend that those streets be extended, the City Council is ready to pledge itself to make those streets within a certain time?—I do not think so; I do not think the Council would pledge itself to do in regard to those streets anything more than it is bound to do in regard to any other street in Melbourne.

50. Mr. Steuart.—I think you are putting Mr. Fitzgibbon in a false position, by asking his opinion upon this. I protest to him being asked to take the position of the City Council.

51. (to the Commissioner, to the witness).—Of course that leaves us in this position: that if the streets are recommended to be extended westward, there is no guarantee at all that they would ever be made at all by the Council?—Yes, there is the guarantee of all the streets that have ever been made in the City of Melbourne.

52. But take those particular streets?—I say that street is an exceptional one. It pays no rates. The whole of the traffic coming from the railway department does not pay one penny of rates; and I would
say this, that the whole experience of the city of Melbourne is perfect justification for saying that where E.G. Fitzgibbon, Esq.,
streets are wanted by the ratepayers, streets will be made; and as far as I can speak, I thank Alderman steward from not attempting to put myself in a false position. I only speak from experience, and my experience is that, that where ratepayers exist and require streets to be made and conveniences to be provided, the city make those streets and provide those conveniences.

53. I think I understood you to say that some property vested in the Railway Commissioners, but occupied by private individuals, is not liable to be rated?—That is so.

54. May I ask you if property other than that that is property of the Crown, other than that vested in the Railway Commissioners and occupied by private persons, is subject to local rating?—Yes, the Crown lands which are unsold are not liable to rating. The Crown lands or private tenements held for the public uses, or held by private individuals for the purposes of the Crown, are exempt from rating.

55. I ask this question from you, more as a private individual, but one having a very large connexion with municipal affairs.—Do you believe there ought to be any distinction between property vested in the Railway Commissioners and property vested in the Crown?—I can perfectly understand that it is perfectly right to prevent the railways having to pay rates, but when the railways let lands to private individuals they certainly should not be in a different position from the Crown itself.

56. That is if the land be let for purposes foreign to the railways itself?—I beg your pardon, when they let lands to private individuals for the profit of those private individuals.

57. In other words, the Railway Commissioners do not use those lands for railway purposes, but they let them off to tenants, and those tenants pay no rates; is it that?—Yes, and it is a double wrong, because if the Railway Commissioners did not let off those lands for such purposes, there are private owners of lands, who have bought lands and paid the Crown for them, who would be able to let those lands. Then their lands would come into requisition, and at present they are not called for.

58. And the tenants of the Railway Commissioners may perhaps build warehouses, &c., and use and wear the streets just as much as those who occupy the land of private owners?—Quite so.

59. And, therefore, from that point of view, it is comparatively injurious, and a manifest injustice to the municipality?—It is a manifest injustice to the municipality in the aggregate, and to the private ratepayers, who are taxed.

60. At present, if the Crown lets a piece of land to a private individual, and he builds a house upon it, he is taxed?—Yes.

61. And the Railway Commissioners really are the Crown in another form, and they should be put in the same position?—Exactly.

The witness withdrew.

William Cain, Esq., Mayor of Melbourne, a Member of the Commission, examined.

62. By the Commission.—You have taken an active part, I believe, in this proposal by the city for the extension of these streets westward?—As a member of the City Council, I have.

63. Were you a member of the Committee who visited the ground, and had a plan compiled showing the feasibility of the scheme?—I was a member of the Committee that visited the ground.

64. In fact, you signed the report?—I did.

65. You were chairman of the Committee?—I was chairman when the report was adopted.

66. You have heard the evidence of Mr. Fitzgibbon—is there any point you object to, or any evidence you wish to add to it?—I think it is pretty concise. I can hardly say more than is said in the report.

66. Do you corroborate Mr. Fitzgibbon in his evidence that the Committee did not take into account the advantage to the city in a revenue point of view, or that the rest of the public cannot claim some compensation for the damage done to the public property by extending those streets?—I felt that we were acting in a national point of view, and I still feel that it would be a national calamity to shut off access from the docks and river by further extending the railway buildings. We were actuated by no selfish motives.

67. There is a direct interest in the City Corporation of Melbourne in this matter, whether they were actuated by selfish motives or not; as aside that question there is a direct interest in the extension.

68. Nothing further than by the extension north or eastwards; Crown lands could be sold to the north; the city undertakes the responsibility to make and cleanse streets there; the same applies to all streets inside the city bounds.

69. The city would treat this extension as any ordinary sale of Crown lands?—That is my view. It would receive the same attention as any other part of the city does, the occupiers paying the same amounts of rates as others do; and I may say that every sixpence that is taken from the ratepayers is expended upon the streets and their property.

70. Did you go into any calculation of the amount that would be extra in rating—the increase in the valuation of the city by this extension of streets?—I have not. I could put myself into that position, I think, but I have not done so.

71. Of course all value of land between Flinders-street and Collins-street, and Bourke-street, is possibly very great, but directly you get outside of those limits, north, is not the price very much diminished indeed; in fact, are not the frontages there occupied by mere hovels in many cases?—In which streets?

72. Some of the streets further north, Lonsdale and Longstaff streets, there are scarcely any business premises at all?—I never took those into consideration. I think that if the railway station was moved north of Bourke-street, it would leave property available for sale that would be more than enough to pay the cost of clearing any station buildings, moving everything back, and leave a large sum of money in the hands of the Crown.

73. To obtain all this advantage of access to the docks, would it be necessary to extend so many streets, seeing that many of those upon this ground are many of them at present occupied by mean structures, and not by warehouses or houses of business at all?—In none of the streets to be extended are there any mean buildings—Collins-street, Bourke-street, Flinders-street, and intermediate streets all have good buildings.

74. No, but further north you have none at all?—I never considered further north than Bourke-street at all.

William Cain, Esq.
74. Would it be worth while to extend the streets north of Bourke-street merely to have lines of dwelling-houses to the docks?—It was never contemplated by me that any street further north than Bourke-street should be extended, except La Trobe-street, by a bridge, to get to the docks and to the Crown property beyond that.

75. Did the committee have a plan prepared?—No, nothing beyond a rough pencilling upon the plan of the land occupied by the Railway Commissioners. Other statements were made loosely, that the block of land between Bourke and Flinders-street as being so many acres, and, assuming that the extensions of the streets named were made so many acres—meant so much money—but no plan was prepared during the time this discussion went on.

76. You had the plan of the proposed docks?—Yes, that plan was available.

77. Now that the plan has been so much modified by the decision of the Harbour Trust, would it not modify the decision of your committee?—It was upon the present modified plan we were operating.

78. The present one?—Yes, it was put before us when it returned from England. I understood the plan was drawn up by Mr. Brady, and sanctioned by Sir John Coodes, and that was the plan we were considering—the present plan.

79. Now the Harbour Trust, I feel, are satisfied with the extension of Flinders-street and Collins-street, and authorizes Mr. Hodgkinson to say so to this Commission. I presume the Council would not be satisfied with the extension of those two streets?—I think the council wish to have free access to the docks. If it could be shown conclusively to the Council that Collins and Flinders-streets were sufficient to admit of that access, the Council certainly would have to say yes.

80. Then all that the Council asks for is access to the docks?—Access to the docks, and by the extensions to the country beyond.

81. Not the extension of the city?—The Council look to this large piece of unoccupied land westward of the dock, so to speak, that land, and connect it with the city by one line or two lines of road. That is the point the Council look at it from, and if this can be provided before the land is covered by permanent buildings, it will be an advantage to the State to have good access provided to reach it.

82. We have to report upon the advisability of extending the city westward, and whether we cannot extend the city westward in the way proposed with the best means of access to the docks. I understand that all the city has been struggling hard for all through has been to get access to and from the docks?—To and from the docks, and the land to the westward.

83. Land outside the city boundaries?—Land outside the city boundaries.

84. Then does the city contemplate having that land added to its area?—No, that is outside our contemplation.

85. Mr. Stewart.—We do not want an inch of territory; all we want is access.

86. Mr. Cain.—You may be clear upon this point, that the city have no designs at all upon the land westward, but in carrying out the streets over what is now railway land that portion would be under city control; but beyond the city boundary, as at present laid down, the city have no views.

87. You say that the object of the Council is to obtain communication with this land beyond the docks—that coloured yellow?—Firstly to the docks.

88. To the land lying further?—That secondly.

89. What access would the extension of either Bourke, Collins, or La Trobe-streets, or any street south of Dudley-street, give to the docks?—It would flank the docks. The piece of land marked here as belonging to the docks is laid out on the plan round this line—pointing to the plan—large quays are made, and the extension of those streets would firstly give access to the docks. It is necessary to go round those docks to get to the shipping, and going round the docks you would be on the Crown lands to the westward.

90. That is a very roundabout way of getting to the yellow land?—There is no other means.

91. Dudley-street is a direct means of communicating?—It is direct too part of the city where there is little business, but does not afford sufficient highway where it passes under the railway.

92. You do not know what extent the blue land will be cut up by docks?—There is a plan before us. That is the position—firstly to the docks, then round the docks, to get upon the land to the westward.

93. Mr. Stewart.—In fact, the only means of access to the yellow land from any part of Melbourne is either by the culvert at Dudley-street or the North Melbourne bridge, so that while Collins-street and Flinders-street may be said to have direct access to the docks, still Melbourne cannot approach the land.

94. By the Commission (to the Witness).—Are you aware that numerous beringes, taken over a long series of years, have shown that the strata of the swamp are very unsatisfactory in regard to getting a foundation?—I am quite aware that the beringes are of a soft nature.

95. Consequently unsatisfactory, for though of course by suitable means you can establish foundations in any strata, however unsatisfactory, yet in this case only buildings of a very good and solid and expensive type could be built; ordinary dwelling-houses would not be suitable?—Upon that point I would make a comparison between the Melbourne swamp and a great part of Holland. Take Rotterdam and Amsterdam. In former years every building that had to be put up in those towns had to be piled. They have abandoned that system now, and they build fearlessly upon (so far as I can judge) similar ground to the Melbourne swamp. I can say further that I built many years ago in Melbourne what is now Connell and Hogarth's warehouse, at the bottom end of Market-street, and the foundation there is similar to the ground on Melbourne swamp, and I found no difficulty, the building shows for itself. The foundations were heavily planked with reedm. The roadway of Flinders-street is laid upon wood planking also.

96. Are you aware that in January 1858 we had to investigate a very serious subsidence that took place in a railway embankment then in course of construction in the swamp, though it was laid upon a very solid bed of fascines?—I am aware that subsidence has taken place to ten times the extent of that in other embankments.

97. Are you aware that in America, in cases like that of the swamp, the practice is to depend upon piles, which, though they do not reach the bottom, are held in place by the adhesiveness of the silt?—Yes. The plan in Amsterdam and Rotterdam now is to depend upon the sand. Very recently I read a description of an immense church that had been erected. They dug out the trenches and filled them in with four feet of sand; it is found to be an effective foundation to build the heaviest structures upon.
98. Port Adelaide is built upon swamp land?—To meet that there is the Melbourne Gasworks, built to a certain extent upon similar stuff, close to the margin of the swamp.

101. Some parts of the ground are occupied by old rock which they call dolerite, upon a steep slope, and these buildings within the gas-works are upon the side of the steep rock, but a little further it goes down quite steep and they had no foundation for a new gasometer, and could do nothing at all there. Are you aware of that?—I have heard so, but did they ever dig down upon the hard dolerite?

102. They did. I have the section of it myself?—From what I have seen and read I have no hesitation in thinking, for myself, that the question of foundations would be easily mastered.

103. For important buildings?—For ordinary buildings likely to be erected there; stores, and such like. You see it in the lower part of London, town opposite Woolwich. I have seen them excavating there in the site.

104. As a matter of fact, you have not considered the borings at this place at all?—I have noticed the borings upon the plans.

105. You have not considered the peculiar circumstances of the place?—I have by comparison. I have heard the question raised before by Mr. Hodgkinson at the last day of meeting, also prior to that. I have no doubt in my own mind, any gentleman can make the same comparison, and read the same information, and learn what they are doing in other places.

106. When you interviewed the Commissioners did there appear to be a disposition on their part to meet the views of the City Council?—I can hardly say that. I did think, at first, that there was not, but afterwards I came to the conclusion that the Railway Commissioners felt they were like private individuals—no going to part with a foot of land if they could hold it. I think they look upon it as property that is in their possession, and they (perhaps rightly) mean to hold every acre of it if they can, irrespective of what the requirements of the city of Melbourne are.

107. Did they mention any specific objection to the proposal?—No, I do not think they did.

108. Have I in my mind all the time the extension of the streets, as proposed by the City Council?—The streets could not be extended, to my mind, without the Railway Commissioners moving back their station and yards and sheds, because I cannot myself see how it would be possible to extend the streets beyond Spencer-street and carry on the traffic in the railway yard. It would be necessary to push them back to a line, and either pass under the proposed viaduct connecting Spencer-street station with Flinders-street, or to move them over, which I do not think would be judicious.

109. Did they mention that as the reason why they did not consent?—I do not recollect it.

110. That would involve, then, the placing of the passenger station perhaps a quarter of a mile or half a mile further back?—Back in what direction?

111. Further away from the city, or further north?—To the line of Bourke-street. Practically, it is in the line of Bourke-street now, if you look at it.

112. For instance, did the Commissioners urge that it would lengthen the route to Melbourne, say from the northern suburbs, and from the country?—No, I do not think so.

113. Did the City Council take into consideration the question whether the approach from that side to Melbourne would be lengthened or otherwise?—The approach from Melbourne to the station?

114. Say from the North Melbourne Station?—I, individually, and many others, never thought of moving the railway station further north than Bourke-street.

115. But how about further west?—It would be west of Spencer-street about ten chains; it could not very well be otherwise. It would not extend the route.

116. You proposed to go to La Trobe-street?—No, a viaduct to pass over the railway there.

117. You propose the extension of La Trobe-street as well as Bourke-street?—No, I proposed a bridge to pass over, but not to interfere with the yards.

118. Did your surveyor make any estimate of the cost?—No.

119. Or take any levels at all?—The plan provided by the Railway Department, which I think I saw upon the table at the last meeting, shows the levels, but no official plan has been prepared by the corporation, nor has any instruction been given.

120. When the interview took place with the Commissioners, and it was proposed to put Bourke-street through, did they raise any objection to the quantity of ground being insufficient; would it be sufficient for their railway purposes?—Observe by this plan that running Bourke-street through just takes about one-half the railway reserve?—Certainly not; recently they have taken in a very large area to the north, some 190 acres; within the last twelve months they have applied for it.

121. The docks lie between these two, and putting the station back in a line with Bourke-street takes away half the reserve?—That reserve, except one good shed upon it, is used for timber and firewood at present, and to meet the requirements of the extended traffic, they have applied that a large portion of land here—pointing to the plan—may be given to them, from which I judge they would move their engine-sheds and workshops upon this land, and very likely the timber yards also. I would suggest that if the Commission could see their way to walk over the site and see for themselves it would be well.

122. The Chairman.—This letter settles that question. The Commissioners are asked what land, in their opinion, they require, and they say all.

123. Mr. Stewart.—Yes, Mr. Spight made no secret of the fact that they mean to stick to every inch of it.

124. The witness.—In fact, an application has been made for a piece of land now in the occupation of the city, which they keep for gardens and plant used in connexion with the cleansing of the city, by the gasworks, and not at all connected with the railway.

125. Was not that in connexion with the stores?—I do not know what the motive was, but they made an application for it. It is bought by the Harbour Trust land. This—producing a plan—is a plan that came from the Crown Lands Office. That is the piece of land—pointing out the same.}

126. What was the reason assigned by the Railway Commissioners for asking for a piece of land that the council is occupying now?—That never was stated. No reason was ever assigned to us. We were made aware of it through holding of the application being put in for it.
125. Your proposition is that the Railway Commissioners want to stick to all they have got. We must give them the same credit for unselfish motives that you ask for the City Council? — Quite so. I suppose we all in the position of Commissioners, that we would do the best for the interest we served. — [witness explained the plan last put in].

126. Is there not a proposition by the Harbour Trust to establish large grain stores here, and this would give means of access to it? — We never heard of that. The land permanently reserved for Railway purposes is coloured red, and the land applied for by the Commissioners is here — [pointing out the name] coloured blue.

127. And the land temporarily reserved is coloured pink? — Yes.

128. No plan was prepared at all by the city when negotiating with the Commissioners upon the subject, except a few pencil marks upon the existing plan? — No.

129. But did not the Railway Commissioners themselves produce a plan, showing all their works and carrying all the streets through, and showing what they would give? — When the Railway Commissioners came we were prepared to ask them to produce their plan.

130. But the question is, was that plan produced at the time? — There were two plans brought by the Commissioners, one showing the yard; a second plan was brought which was not exposed for inspection; it was laid upon the table by mistake; as far as I could judge, that plan was prepared pretty nearly upon the lines we now ask, but it was not exhibited, it was rolled up and odds given to take it away.

131. The important point I think we want to get at is this, that the City Council passed a series of resolutions, appointed a committee to do a certain thing, and that committee reported; and ultimately there was a negotiation with the Railway Department about the extension of these streets, and all that was done without the city preparing any plan, taking any levels, or doing anything more than the committee going over the ground? — Nothing more than was done upon the plan such as that before you, or the plan that the Commissioners may have themselves.

132. And when the City Council, through its representatives, interviewed the Commissioners, the Commissioners produced a plan, and upon that plan certain pencill marks were put, showing what the city proposed to do; is that it? — No.

133. Mr Stewart. — If it is proposed to ask Mr. Cain what the Commissioners proposed, I will volunteer, as the Mayor for the time being, and as the chairman of the Committee, to say what they proposed, but I would suggest that the Commissioners should be examined.

134. By the Commission (to the witness). — All that was done by the city without their preparing any plan whatever? — Further than what is upon the plan now before you, or a similar plan.

135. Assuming that the City Council are of opinion, and express that opinion, that if the thing can be done it would be desirable? — Up to a stage that was the position, but we can produce evidence that it can be done. I fancy the Commissioners themselves have a plan showing that the streets were at one time intended to be extended through that way.

136. But this evidence goes further than that. I understand from the evidence that the City Council have not prepared a plan; if I understand you now, you say you are prepared? — No, pardon me. When we were negotiating with the Commissioners no plan was prepared, and I say now that no official plan has been prepared yet by the order of the City Council, but it is quite possible that we can prepare a plan to show it.

137. Are you not aware that Flinders-street was very nearly thrown open without the intervention of the City Council; the Harbour Trust nearly came to terms with the Commissioners, only the amount asked was too much? — Yes, in fact it always appeared a puzzle to me why the Harbour Trust were asked to pay money at all for opening a street through Crown lands.

138. Did the city correspond with the Chamber of Commerce upon this matter? — They did.

139. What was the nature of the communication; do you remember? — Pardon me if I refer that to Mr. Fitzgibbon.

140. Did the Committee of which you were chairman have an interview with the Chamber of Commerce? — No, I think the reply from them was not very definite; I acted as chairman of that Committee simply as a member of the City Council. I had no standing, either as chairman of the Committee or even the position I have now, so really I am not aware what the correspondence was.

141. The Chairman appears to have a great deal in the care of the City Council not making the streets ready enough if they were extended. As a matter of practice in the past have streets been proclaimed, or extensions of streets, and placed under the administration of the City Council under conditions that they should make them within a given time? — No, none that I am aware of. Not a street has been placed under the control of the City Council with such a condition.

142. That is, the discretion of the Council in the matter of streets has hitherto been always free and unfettered? — Exercised freely as they thought the money was available, and they thought the necessities required it; but I might volunteer a statement, and it is this, that I am sure that if the streets were thrown upon the City Council to make they would treat them as they have treated all other streets in the city, and deal with them readily.

The witness withdrew.

Edmund Gerald FitzGibbon, Esq., Town Clerk of the City of Melbourne, further examined.

143. The Witness. — May I be pardoned for saying one word in regard to what appears to be the suggestion, that the City Council should pay for, or buy, these streets that it is proposed should be laid out.

144. By the Commission. — It has not been suggested? — I understood that the view was that there was some gain coming to the City Council, for which the City Council should give compensation. I only desire to say this, that in all my experience in this country, and in reading of municipal Government in other countries, I never heard of such a suggestion as that the owner of property, after he laid out streets in his property, should require the municipality to pay for the laying out of the same. Of course this case is very different from any ordinary dealing with Crown lands. Here, in order to carry out the views of the city, we have to destroy public property, and to put the public, possibly to inconvenience. The question is, of one of the parties to the thing, the city—which is largely interested
In the pecuniary view—willing to be partaker in paying for the destruction of public property? As to that, I pardon my saying that the City Council does not recognise or accept that view. The City Council is not largely interested, in a pecuniary sense, in regard to the laying off of these streets. It recognises only that there is territory which the City Council has no interest whatever in, and that that territory it will be to the great benefit of the State to lay off, and that it is the State that is pecuniarily interested.

146. Is not there another difficulty in the way, and is that is, while the Commissioners are empowered under their Act to sell, they are not empowered to give the land to anybody?—I apprehend that an Act of Parliament, under any circumstances, is necessary. Those things cannot be carried out without an Act of Parliament.

147. If, by selling the land we are upon, sufficient funds can be obtained to build a railway station equal to our requirements, not for the present day merely but twenty or thirty years hence, it would be an advantage to the Railway Department, and at the same time would give to the public the necessary advantage of communication between the city and the lands west of the railway, so it would be a public convenience, as well as a great gain to the Railway Department, in obtaining funds to erect public buildings?—I feel satisfied that it would produce funds enough to do that.

148. You only give that as an individual opinion?—I can supply the figures if you give me notice.

149. Did the City Council, when they proposed to carry the streets through and take about half the reserve, consider the possibility of putting the passenger station in any other part of the city than on the rest of the reserve?—It is set forth in the report that the passenger station be moved to north of Bourke-street.

150. No, no—I ask the question, is that sufficient. For instance, going back to the Saltwater river, or North Melbourne, and traversing, and going out at the old cattle yards, and taking passengers there?—That was not considered.

151. Did you any plan proposed in the event of there not being sufficient room there?—No, we had no other plan.

The witness withdraw.

Adjourned to to-morrow, at Two o'clock.

FRIDAY, 18TH MARCH, 1887.

Present:

The Hon. Col. F. T. Sargood, C.M.G., M.L.C.,
J. A. Wallace, M.L.C.,
N. Thomson, M.L.C.,
W. Maddern, M.L.A.,
W. Anderson, Esq., M.L.A.,
J. Laurens, Esq., M.L.A.,
D. M. Davies, Esq., M.L.A.,
J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.L.A.,
P. Wright, Esq., M.L.A.,
W. Cain, Esq.,
J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
C. Hodgkinson, Esq.,

Richard Spight, Esq., Chairman of the Commissioners of Railways, examined.

152. By the Commission.—Do you remember the proposition made by the City Council to the Railway Department for the extension of the streets across the Railway reserve?—The City Council have spoken in two senses. They have at one time spoken about access to the docks, and, at other times, about the extension of the city westward. The first interview we had with the City Council was just after I came into the colony, and the request that was then made was that arrangements should be provided for carrying Collins-street over to the site of the docks, which we then looked at as a mere question of access.

153. That was the first proposition made?—Yes.

154. How was that received by the department?—We pointed out that there was a proposition to widen Flinders-street, and the question of making an access to the docks from Collins-street, without taking into account the place where that communication would have to be made, and where it would terminate, would not be a very great advantage, but would cost a considerable amount of money.

155. That is the Collins-street extension?—Yes.

156. Then the Railway Department considered that Flinders-street would afford sufficient access to the docks?—We did.

157. Was it on that occasion that a money price was put upon the land that would be required for the purpose?—No. The negotiation for the widening of Flinders-street was independent of any question of access further north. It was a matter that originated between the Railway Department and the Harbour Trust. The Harbour Trust put themselves in communication with us, and we went into the matter, and we were prepared to give up something like six acres of land for the purpose of widening Flinders-street, because we felt that a better thoroughfare to the docks was necessary; and we told the Harbour Trust that the works of the department which would be disturbed by giving up those six acres would cost something like £24,000, and that if they were prepared to reimburse us that sum, we would give them the land.

158. It was not the value of the land?—We did not take that into account at all.

159. Was it the destruction of buildings?—Simply the destruction of railway outlay; it takes off the end of one of the sheds, and destroys certain portions of permanent way, and removes deposit that has cost the Railway Department so much to place there.

160. How was that proposition received by the Council?—We communicated, as I say, with the Harbour Trust—told them we were prepared to agree to the widening of the street on those terms, and we are at the present time waiting their reply.

161. Was there any other step taken at that time?—No.

162. Then what was the second proposition, and when did it take place?—The second proposition, if I recollect right, was a deputation of the City Council that waited upon the Minister, with reference to the extension of the city westward, and the question of access and extension were there both dealt with; it
Richard Spaight, Esq.,
Keswick,
16th March 1857.

I did not see a definite proposition that there should be either extension or access, but it must be something that would enable the city to get to the docks.

163. Did the proposition become a much wider one on the second occasion? — It did.
164. Did the Council make any definite proposal to the Railway Department in the matter? — No.
165. Has the department taken that proposition into consideration? —
166. Mr. Stewart. — It is only right to say that Mr. Spaight must be speaking, not from his own knowledge, but from the newspaper report. I was at the interview.
167. Mr. Spaight. — I was not present at the interview; I dealt with the Minister; I simply read what was supposed to have passed at that meeting in the railway newspaper.
168. By the Commission. — Have the Commissioners ever taken into consideration this proposal to extend all those streets across the station ground? — Before the appointment of this Commission, the City Council and the Railways Commissioners were brought together for the purpose of discussing this question; we met in the Mayor's room (Mr. Stewart was Mayor at that time) to talk the matter over, to see if there was anything to be done in getting ground at that meeting, I understand, opening the discussion, that there were those two phases of the question — access and extension. I said, if extension of the city westward means taking away any portion of the railway station, we, as Commissioners, and as trustees of the railway property, must oppose it distinctly and clearly; but if it means a question of getting access to the docks, we are quite prepared to consider the question from that point of view, the only point then to be considered being the one who is to provide the money to give that access? —
169. But the department had already stated its idea of giving access to the docks as simply widening Flinders-street? — At the first meeting we had with the City Council we said that provision was being made to widen Flinders-street, and we thought it sufficient, but in the subsequent meeting I speak of at the Town Hall, we said that if more accesses were required, and it did not take away the railway property, it was only a question of who would provide the money to do it — that physically it was possible to do it.
170. When you say railway property, what do you mean? — I mean the present site of the Spencer-street Railway Station.
171. You mean the reserved land? — I will show you what I mean — producing a plan. We supplied you with a copy and a map, and this is a piece of it. I mean the land that is within the tinted edges of the map, bounded on the north by La Trobe-street, and on the south by Flinders-street.
172. You say it took no railway property, but no street could be extended without taking railway property? — Yes, it could, a street could be led over the railway or under the railway, leaving the surface of the land available for railway purposes.
173. Did you then take into consideration the practicality of extending Collins-street or the other streets without injuring the railway property? — Engineeringly, it is possible to carry a street over; whether it is wise to incur the expense is a matter we did not determine; we do not want the streets; any one else that wants them would, of course, have to face the question of expense.
174. Do you not think, knowing the ground as you do now, that the extension of Collins or Bourke-street would give sufficient access to the docks? — I do not see that that would give any material assistance, as a matter of access to the docks.
175. Upon what do you base that opinion? — I think that the places at which the streets would terminate, and the intervention of railway communication between the railway yards and the dock yards, would be such as to interfere very seriously with any advantage that an additional access to the docks that would be afforded by that connexion might give.
176. You speak of carrying Collins-street over the railway works; that would not contemplate selling any land fronting the projected street? — It would not.
177. It would be a sort of elevated roadway? — Simply a viaduct to get from A to B.
178. And none of the station ground would have to be sold at all? — No; but there would be the expense of face of constructing it, which you might put down at anything between £150,000 and £200,000.
179. For the one street? — Yes.
180. Do you think that any of this land could be given up? take that land that runs south of the alignment of Bourke-street, if produced across the swamp, could the Railway Department, by any engineering method, so curtail the station ground, not to its own disadvantage, and give up that block of land for the extension of the city? — I do not think any piece of land there is worth more to anybody than that piece of land is to the Railway Department.
181. That between Bourke and Flinders-streets? — Yes.
182. Do you think a contingency of this kind might arise, if this piece of land were alienated now, the department might, at some future time, have to purchase it back again? — If I were to speak from my experience at home of bringing railways into cities, instead of driving them out of cities, I should say that the simple principle has it that the railway company shall be in a position to beat deal with the traffic, and when it is best dealing with the traffic in its own interests it is dealing best for the public; and the tendency always is to get into the city, and in London alone millions of money have been spent to get half a mile or three-quarters of a mile nearer to the point of delivery which is previously nearer; and I have no hesitation in saying that, if the Victorian Railways were a private company, and they were cut off, as it is proposed to cut them off now, in a few years time they would be compelled to go and buy back the property at twice the price it is worth at the present moment.
183. You know that one of the projects is the conversion of the Hobson's Bay Station into a great central passenger station, and leaving the Spencer-street station as one merely for goods. What do you think about that idea? — I think it would be the greatest possible mistake to deal with main line trains and suburban trains at one station; even now, with the suburban traffic that we have at Flinders-street, it is a most difficult thing to cross Flinders-street to get to and from the station. In the case of main line trains, passengers are accompanied with luggage, cars have to wait upon them; suburban traffic disperses itself. But concentrate the main line trains in Flinders-street (apart altogether from the question as to whether there is room), and you would have such a block that you would not be able to make your work at all.
184. Then your views entirely coincide with those of the late Mr. Higbotham, who condemned the Eliza-3c-street station as a central passenger station? — I consider that station should be made as commodious as possible to deal with the suburban traffic, both north and south of the Yarra; it could be so arranged that
the suburban trains from Essendon, Coburg, and all this side should run into the Flinders-street station, Richard Sprigley, Esq., as 
and when you run those trains there, you would have such an addition to the suburban traffic that you have 
now got there, which is at present confined to the south, that it will take us all our time to pass the traffic 
in and out of the place; and certainly I agree with Mt. Higginbotham that it would be most unwise to 
concentrate all traffic at one point.

185. The traffic, I understand, is increasing at an enormous rate there?—It is increasing, and very largely.

186. Do you know the number of trains per day that arrive and depart at Hobson's Bay Station? 
—I have not got it out, but I think it is close upon 500.

187. And that is increasing at a very rapid rate?—It is. Within the last ten years the traffic upon 
the Victorian Railways has increased two and a half times.

188. In ten years?—Yes; and with the additional mileage of railway that is being constructed for 
the development of the colony, that growth must increase in a greater ratio; and if I were to be here in 
ten years time I should begin to dread the difficulty of the limited accommodation the Railway Department 
will have.

189. When you say that the traffic has increased two and a half times, does that apply to the 
Spencer-street side as well as the other?—I take the total gross increase of the Victorian railway revenue; 
it is two and a half times in ten years.

190. Has that great increase of traffic been at the suburban station?—I do not say that, but we 
carry twenty-two millions of people upon the suburban lines per annum, at the present moment.

191. Can you say as to the portion of ground occupied at Spencer-street for station and railway 
purposes—what ratio does it bear to previous traffic, what it did five or six years ago?—No, I cannot tell you 
that; I can get it out for you if you would like it, but at the present time we have an accommodation that 
is in absolute use, occupying 65 acres of ground.

192. Is that the two stations?—Yes; when I say 65 acres, I speak of the accommodation for goods 
traffic.

193. At the two stations?—At the two stations; and the reason I put them together is this—that the 
goods traffic of Flinders-street, when that station is re-arranged, must be removed from there, and 
therefore it must be accommodated at Spencer-street, and that can only be done when the viaduct between 
the two places is constructed. In the railway reserve, upon the plan we have supplied to you, we have 
145 acres of land, and we propose to give up about 6 acres for the widening of Flinders-street, so that that 
leaves a net reserve of 139 acres. Now looking at the fact that in the last ten years the traffic has 
increased two and a half times, it is not an unreasonable provision to make that we should have within our 
own control something equivalent to two and a half times for the next ten years. When we have provided 
our passenger station here at Spencer-street, which we propose to make terminating upon Collins-street, 
and continuing Collins-street to the extent of the frontage of the passenger station, the sidings and 
other conveniences connected with the passenger station will occupy about 30 acres odd. We are 
occurring now full of exporting goods traffic; that, therefore, leaves us 35 acres of available space 
within our present reserve for the extensions and for accommodating our goods traffic. Thirty-five 
on sixty-five is just about half; and I will undertake to say that, in ten years time, instead of selling 
property we shall want to buy it.

194. Is this the Spencer-street site?—Bound on the north by Dudley-street and on the south by 
Flinders-street.

195. The 65 acres you mentioned is bounded there?—Yes, certainly; the 145 acres of which I spoke, 
35 acres of which is required for the passenger station, lies between Dudley-street on the north and 
Flinders-street on the south.

196. The newly-acquired ground by the Railway Department is not within that area?—No.

197. The piece of land you would give up, if this street were carried on, appears to be the most 
valuable land in the railway system?—It just means this: that if we were to cut off, say by Bowker-street, 
we should have to give up about 55 or 59 acres.

198. Does the 65 acres include those sites that are now let for firewood yards and timber yards?
—Yes.

199. Not used strictly for railway purposes?—Yes.

200. All that is in pink?—Yes.

201. There have been some fresh reservations of land for railway purposes during the last few 
years, I understand?—Yes, we have obtained land just up above Dudley-street.

202. Was the purpose to which the Railway Department intend to devote that land?—Of 
course we have in view the docks, and no doubt when those docks are constructed there will be a large 
central concentration of traffic there, and we must have our railway tracks in a convenient position to work the 
traffic to and from them. Then there is the question of locomotive sheds; as you know, we have very 
limited accommodation where we are; the land will be more valuable when the present sheds are removed, 
and a considerable portion of that place will be occupied with the engine sheds, coal stables, and the 
necessary auxiliaries for working the locomotive department; and then we shall require a large number of 
sidings for accommodating the traffic that is so be brought down from the country and distributed when it 
arives in Melbourne.

203. Then the requirements of the Railway Department are so great that this block of land 
coloured yellow here will always have a very poor means of access to it?—No, they can get into that 
yellow land whenever it is wanted; if you were to ask me, I should like to keep it for railway purposes 
eventually, looking far enough ahead; but if it is to be used for other purposes there are means of getting 
it without interfering with the railway works. The access to the docks does not give access to that 
yellow land.

204. From your experience of private companies that have had to pay large sums of money to get 
closer to the point of delivery, can you give two or three instances that may be in your mind at the present 
moment?—Take the case of the company I was associated with at heme. We promoted a line into 
London in 1869 something, I cannot recollect the exact date, but it was after 1866, and then we had 
running powers into London over the Great Northern line; and we had interchanges of traffic with other 

* The Crown lands forming the unalienated portion of the West Melbourne swamp.
companies that gathered on to us, three or four of them; but we thought it better to get into London ourselves, and we went to London, and of course buying land in the neighbourhood of London is a very serious matter, and directors who have to consider their ability to pay dividends at the end of the half-year do not like to look too far ahead; and we had before us a proposition to buy 300 acres of land within six miles of London at £500 an acre. We thought, "Well 100 acres will be enough to go on with, and we will have bought not the 300." We bought the 100. In less than five years we had to buy the other 100 acres, and we had to give £2,000 as acre for it.

209. Then, shortly putting it, I suppose your contention is that this land is now being put to valuable use in being retained by the Railway Department?—I do think so, thoroughly and completely.

200. And none of this land could be given up by the department to make street extensions except in the way you propose to carry a street over the railways, thereby keeping the land?—If ever it is done, it will be contrary to my advice.

201. Do I understand you to say that in your opinion Flinders-street alone, if widened, would give sufficient access to the docks?—I think it would. I do not see what access the Collins-street extension would give—how would it facilitate the access to the docks? If you look at the green plan before you, that is the dock scheme that has been recently approved by the Harbour Trust, and here is Collins-street; if you extend Collins-street across the land here you drop into the Gasworks chimney.

202. But you might put that in upon a curve?—Put it, if you like, in that way, and say you carry approaches down to it from both sides; so far as the Flinders-street approach is concerned, there is nothing to be gained by it, so far as the approach is concerned; on the north side you drop down on to the Dock Company's road. Now the Dock Company are not going to make those docks without having railway access; they will want the docks and jetties will want the docks, and the railway station intersecting this road in half-a-dozen places or more, and therefore the utility of the road that would have access given to it by the construction of the viaduct for the purpose of getting to any place beyond the docks will be reduced in usefulness by the fact that railway service will be always going on.

203. You misunderstand me, I am not speaking of access to the yellow*?—Then if you simply say as a more access to the docks, of course additional communication would be afforded, but the question is, is it worth the cost to pay for? if it can be done at any time, it need not be done now; and, if after experience of the dock traffic, it is proved that Flinders-street is not sufficient to carry off the traffic, there is no reason why our railway arrangements within our reserves should not be so fixed that that viaduct shall be constructed in twenty years time upon terms to be agreed upon by the parties that want it.

204. Would you recommend a viaduct to cross the railway yard to ascend 20 feet on the Collins-street side, and descend 40 feet upon the dock side?—It would be preferable to a sub-way.

205. Would not a crossing upon the level?—That cuts through our property.

206. But would it not be a much more serviceable means of access to the docks?—Of course an approach to the dock upon the level of the railway land would be better than approaching the dock by a viaduct, but an approach to the dock upon the level of the land would take away railway property, which we cannot afford to part with.

217. Assuming that what you say is correct, would you think that the whole of the traffic to those docks is to be carried out by the railway?—No, certainly not.

218. Besides, you say certain lines of railway would be laid into the docks; that would lead us to think that there would be no necessity for a horse road way to the docks at all?—Certainly not, I have not suggested that; I say that Flinders-street of the width it is proposed to construct it, will afford, for a long time to come, all the facilities that are requisite for road traffic and from Melbourne and the docks.

219. But the traffic in Flinders-street, even now, is crowded, irrespective of what may be brought in by the docks, and irrespective of what may be brought by the extension of the wharves down river?—I do not know that there will be anything more than the natural growth of traffic to go up Flinders-street when the docks are constructed besides what goes up by the present arrangement, but no doubt the Harbour Trust contemplate that the railway traffic is to be one of their best customers, because the jetties are laid out with railways to it.

220. Would the traffic be greater by horses into the city or by railways direct?—I should say that two-thirds would be done direct by the railway.

221. Assuming that, you say that you require more space for the working of the traffic, if 40 acres were taken off there and 40 acres added on to here—[pointing to the map]—would not that compensate?—No, it would not.

222. The land intrinsically would not be so valuable, but the space would be equally great?—I will tell you why—of course as regards space and as regards the handling the traffic, you could do it upon a piece of country land just as well as upon a piece of town land, but it would involve our moving our traffic that has to be carted into and out of Melbourne some distance, equal to from half a mile to a mile further away from the present Commissioners, as Railway Commissioners, and well founded representations, and we feel it would be too much to have any hesitation in saying that if our goods traffic were moved to the place where you say there are forty acres of land further away, the taxation to the producer and the consumer would far more than counterbalance any advantage that might be derived from the sale of this piece of frontage for business purposes, and the use of the other piece of land for railway purposes.

223. I did not suggest that this traffic should be moved up to there; the most that would happen would be that the traffic now done upon a piece of ground south of Collins-street, would be done upon a piece of ground north of Bourke-street, or rather, what is now on Bourke-street would represent the frontage to Bourke-street, only moved twenty chains north, ten chains each block?—Yes, but you know, if you have to provide for your accommodation you must look ahead, as you will admit.

224. If you cut off at Collins-street or Bourke-street you must push your map back.


* See footnote page 11.
221. Twenty chains in the case of Bourke-street?—Twenty chains in the case of Bourke-street, you would have to push it back and give it the same amount of accommodation, and I say we have too little now.

222. There is more land available up there?—But allow me, to give us the same amount of accommodation, making Bourke-street the line, we should have to buy the property. We should have to widen out the railway from near the North Melbourne station.

223. Will you call the 146 acres "A"? in order to give a certain area; to divide block "A" by a certain number of acres, you would have to buy land north of that block to that extent?—Yes, we should have to widen our line south of North Melbourne station, and buy that high-lying ground which is bounded by Allisterly-street, extending out very nearly to Ireland-street, bringing the frontage of the railway, taking La Trobe-street, which is now abutting upon Spencer-street, carrying the Spencer-street frontage up to Roslyn-street. [The witness marked the plan accordingly. ]—We should have to go to Hawke-street.

224. Something like the present shape of the crescent?—Something like it.

225. That is so as to secure the same amount of frontage to Spencer-street, I understand?—No; so as to secure a space equal to that taken away.

226. A space, and that space would front upon Spencer-street?—I say that, to take the alternative, we must come on the other side of the railway, still more inconvenience the traffic, and sit down upon the land belonging to the Harbour Trust.

227. There would be no alternative but to secure this ground?—None at all.

228. If you had a very large sum given to you, say £200,000 or £300,000, to remove the railway station, would it not then be possible to give the land south of Collins-street without buying fresh land?—It is not a question of money at all. I have no hesitation in telling you that, if I had to negotiate for the purchase of the Victorian Railways, supposing it was a possible quantity that they should be leased or bought out, the difference in the value of those Victorian Railways, consequent upon the distinction between having the terminus where it is and being driven further back, could not be represented by less than two or three millions.

229. Is not, at present, the very large portion of ground I allude to, between Collins-street and the extension of Flinders-street, vacant ground?—There is a certain portion of ground used for coal yards and timber yards, but I consider it should have ground ahead of your requirements.

230. Are not the buildings upon the ground very straggling; and could not the Railway Commissioners, without spending a large amount of money, concentrate them into less space, and give the same accommodation?—We have taken all that into our account, and, without re-arranging the present station, we have not more than we want.

231. They to understand that no money consideration, even to hundreds of thousands of pounds, would compensate the Railway Department for losing the land south of Collins-street?—That is my opinion.

232. Or, rather, it is not the loss to the Railway Department, but the loss to the community for the cartage of goods?—Exactly; I do not look at it from a private point of view, but from a public point; and from a public point of view, it would be an unwise thing to do.

233. Would it be possible, in your opinion, to carry Collins-street on by a sub-way even, leaving you the ground to the south?—The sub-way would be a very long one. I have only a moral objection to that, no more.

234. It need not be closed in the whole way?—Yes, I think necessarily it would have to be closed in, and would have to be lit up.

235. I think I understand that your intentions are now, that you will build the station facing Collins-street?—Yes.

236. For what purposes would you require the land south of Collins-street?—I will show you—[producing a tracing]. This is a rough sketch, you must not take it as gospel—the proposition is to continue Collins-street as far as the point where the viaduct connecting the Flinders and Spencer-streets stations intersects it.

237. Is that your proposal?—That is our scheme; it has not assumed a definite form yet, but I am asked now, how I propose to use the land south, and that is what I want to show. By extending Collins-street to that point, we get what they call an end-on station; the cab approaches inside the station, and comes up close to the train; the passengers are landed near the trains they want to go by, and in going into Melbourne passengers alight from trains and get into cabs and go clear away. That arrangement terminating there does not at all interfere with our use of the remaining portion of the land south of Collins-street for goods purposes; and the viaduct cuts off there something like 15 to 16 feet, and that point serves round Flinders-street and separates the goods from the passenger traffic. The advantage of this arrangement, as regards passenger traffic, is that all the north suburban lines will run along this connecting line and the trains will stop at Spencer-street, and any member of the public who requires to get out at Spencer-street can get out, and for suburban purposes Spencer-street will be a roadside station. It has the further advantage that the traffic south of the Yarra going up the main lines wants to get rid of the inconvenience of either changing or transferring across from station to station. Trains will run from the Flinders-street station to the Spencer-street station and vice versa in connexion with the main line trains, so that through passengers going up country, and through passengers coming down country, will be able to use by choice the two stations. Then we think that they should by that arrangement the maximum accommodation that the facilities will enable us to afford, and it does not interfere with the utilization of the remaining portion of the space. We tell those who want to go nearer to the city will go to Flinders-street, and be set down there. Whereas if you do that, you have goods traffic at Spencer-street now amounting to a million tons a year, and what it will amount to with its natural growth in ten years' time should be two and a half million tons a year, I need hardly tell you how important it is to have the fullest accommodation for it; then, when Flinders-street is widened, the approaches to all those sheds can be made from all this Flinders-street part, end-on approaches.

238. What will be the width of Flinders-street there?—I think we are giving up 90 feet, plus what they have now.

239. What about this little bit?—That little bit we want for our offices.

240. What use do you make of the land where the present Williamstown sheds are—the land bounded by La Trobe and Spencer-streets?—It is used at present for the shipping traffic to and from Williamstown;
241. What is it proposed to utilize the land for, which has been applied for lately—the land coloured pink—the continuation of Williams's boundary?—The only new land we have reserved is the land where we are taking up those stays.

242. Upon that particular site—what is the intention of the Commissioners to use it for?—For the general traffic of the city of Melbourne.

243. The increasing traffic?—Yes; as I tell you, the 145 acres embrace all that.

244. But there is a very large area of that now not utilized?—It is not half big enough.

245. When you speak of a million tons of goods traffic, does it include the wheat traffic?—Yes, and including the traffic absolutely dealt with at Spencer-street, but not including traffic that goes to Williamstown and Sandridge.

246. But would not a great deal of that go into sheds in the new dock?—But that is the surplusage; it may go in, it will not all go in, the natural transit of the traffic is direct to the ship, they do not want to handle it twice; but this million tons of traffic should be independent of shipment altogether.

247. Not retained for shipment?—Not retained for shipment at all.

248. Have you any idea, at the present time, of the bulk of the firewood traffic?—The bulk of it?

249. The proportion that it bears to the general traffic?—I should say that it would bear the proportion, speaking roughly, and without being tied down to an exact figure, of about one-sixth.

250. Is that likely to continue at Spencer-street?—In our contemplated re-arrangements of the stations, twenty-eight acres of land that are now devoted to firewood will be reduced to five.

251. The bulk of the firewood is conveyed away from here altogether, and you are providing numerous stations at one place and another; would not the firewood traffic naturally take to those stations nearer the consumers?—We find that the more facilities we give there is the more traffic to accommodate, and if we put down a siding at Elsterwick, or North Brighton, or St. Kilda, it does not reduce the traffic at Spencer-street, it simply increases the traffic at the point where we give the facility.

252. Then you think the firewood traffic here is likely to continue?—Yes. There is one point about that traffic: the firewood merchants say that they have to contend keenly with coal imported into the colony, and that people up the country who eat wood and send it down, and the people who sell it, are put upon their beam ends to get the price that will pay them for doing that work; now, if we drive away that traffic and impose upon it an additional tax in the shape of cartage, we simply put an additional burden upon these people.

253. That is not the point I was looking at; the consumers of firewood do not live at this corner of the town, they live at Collingwood or anywhere outside; you are providing stations at those places; would not the firewood rather go to those stations?—I think my first answer applies still, that, notwithstanding the additional sidings we provided, the bulk of firewood traffic does not decrease.

254. Are you acquainted with the circumstances of the railway station at Sydney?—Yes.

255. Are you aware that at the present time there are very loud complaints about the present station being too far from the centre of the town?—No doubt about it; a stranger would see that on entering the place.

256. Are you aware whether any action is being taken to bring the station nearer to the centre of the town?—They are proposing to spend a very large sum to do it.

257. Are you aware what that sum is?—They talk of it in millions.

258. You think the proposal now made to put the stations further afield is contrary to what they are doing in Sydney at present?—Yes, and contrary to what the owner of any private property would do in the interest of a large property where £25,000,000 of capital is invested.

259. Is the wish to put the station in Bourke-street, putting it further from the centre of the city of Melbourne than it is at Collins-street?—Yes; the gravitation of the traffic always has been, and any one standing at the gates will see where it goes.

260. Putting the passenger station upon the line of Bourke-street is putting it nearer to the Post Office than even Collins-street?—I would not like to contend that Collins-street was not even more central than Bourke-street.

261. Collins-street, some years ago, was looked upon as the centre of the city, but the centre is extending northwards every day!—I do not observe that myself.

262. I wish to impress upon you that the moving of the station to Bourke-street is not moving the station further away from the centre of the city than Collins-street is?—It is putting it further away from the location of the traffic.

263. Then your opinion is reduced to this—that for all time to come Flinders-street will be sufficient to carry away all the traffic from the docks?—I do not say that.

264. Then I suppose we may anticipate that there will be some necessity for another means of approach to the docks?—What I say is this: that Flinders-street will, I think, for a long time to come, give all the access.

265. Possibly, but—?—Allow me please, but that the construction of an additional access, if it is heretofore found to be required, could be as easily constructed ten years hence as it could at present.

266. That is by a viaduct under or over?—Yes.

267. Have not the department already considered the propriety of extending Collins-street straight through?—No.

268. Do you mean there is no plan in the possession of the department showing it extended?—No.

269. I think you are making a mistake?—No.

270. Mr. Madden.—It has been already said it is intended to extend it partly.

271. Mr. Stewart.—When I use the word "department," I do not mean the Railway Commissioners; but when Mr. Bent was in office was there a plan showing the extension of Collins-street straight through to the docks?

272. The Witness.—No. I am not aware of that.

273. Mr. Stewart.—I saw it.
274. The Witness.—I have heard talk of a communication to the other side, but I have always heard talk of it as a communication that was either under or over; I never heard talk of any communication that would separate the land south of Collins-street for railway purposes.

275. It is that plan I want; I remember seeing the plan?—I have never seen it, and I would go farther and say that if anybody had been foolish enough to suggest it, I, as responsible for the railway management, would now tell you it is an impolitic thing to do.

276. Mr. Cony.—I think, if my memory does not fail me—I think it is on record in the office that, at an interview with Mr. Gilles, when Minister for Railways, he stated it was the intention to extend Collins-street through?

277. The Witness.—I was not present at the meeting, therefore I cannot say.

278. Mr. Stewart.—No; what Mr. Gilles said was this, just as Mr. Spaight says, that it was intended to prolong Collins-street to a certain point to admit of the passenger traffic; then I asked him, "Do you intend to extend it straight through to the docks?" and he said, "At a future date, yes?"

279. The Witness.—That might be misapprehended; the extension through to the docks might not mean cutting up the railway land, but an under or over.

280. Mr. Stewart.—No, it was the taking down of that site.

281. The Witness.—That has not been in my minds.

282. By the Commissioner.—The street was to be extended upon the frontage of the new station buildings?—Of course, I was only speaking now of what I read, and my inference from what I read was that Collins-street would be extended to the front of the station, and that hereafter, if it was found necessary, the street could be extended to the docks, but he did not say that the land south of Collins-street was going to be cut off, and not to be available for railway purposes. If the street had to be extended and the ground south of Collins-street had to be available for railway purposes, the street must go under or over.

283. How many acres would it take off from your railway reserve taking Collins-street through?—It would be 32 acres, or about a fourth of our present available space.

284. I understood you to say just now that in putting the street through, it would not give much additional accommodation going direct to the docks?—I do not put my opposition to that course upon that ground at all, but if hereafter the traffic is to from the docks is found to require more facilities than Collins-street will give it, in that interests of everybody that communications should be afforded, and that access can be given hereafter if it is wanted, either under or over, and without interfering with the railway, the only consideration being what it will cost to do it, and who is going to pay for it, that is all.

285. Have the Commissioners ever considered whether there is any other site for a general passenger station for the main lines in any other part besides the present reserve?—I think you have got as good a site as you could wish for.

286. Have you ever thought of that portion of ground running towards Richmond from the present suburban site, by the cricket ground?—I would not concentrate the suburban traffic with the main line traffic if I could help it; it would not work properly, it would be a constant source of annoyance and aggravation to everybody.

287. Would there be sufficient space here to separate them?—Looking ahead, I do not think it would. The idea that a central station would be a great thing, that if you can concentrate all traffic it would do well, and that idea has been expanded again and again in London, to bring all the traffic of the eight railway companies into one place, and every practical man has come to the same conclusion, that concentration beyond a certain point is a thing to be avoided.

288. You desire to keep the whole of the present reserve in the interest of the country?—Most decidedly, and if you part with it to-day you will have to buy it back in a few years' time at a considerable enhancement upon the price you got for it.

289. Having regard to the probable large development of traffic if the docks should be constructed, what streets would you recommend to be the best adapted for giving communication? I am thinking of the future now, just for the streets?—I should say that is a matter that depends upon many considerations.

290. I am assuming that the metropolis grows, and the traffic also grows—I think Bourke-street would be preferable to Collins-street, and I think La Trobe-street would be a place midway of access, that is assuming it is found to be wanted.

291. It is upon that assumption that I go.—Yes.

292. In any scheme of your works, are you proposing any works that would strike the line of those streets?—No; in carrying out our arrangements we should do nothing to interfere with the possibility of a communication from Bourke-street and communication from La Trobe-street; and, if it was found essential, a communication from Collins-street.

293. With Bourke-street, how would you go?—We would rather not have Collins-street at any price—I mean, we would rather not have that extended, because it would have to intersect our buildings.

294. Bourke-street would not intersect our buildings.

295. You mean the existing buildings?—No, our plan.

296. You mean in the plan of future operations you erect buildings upon the western side of Collins-street which would prevent its prolongation?—What I say is this, that the extension of Collins-street would be feasible whatever we do; but we would rather not have it, because we should have to arrange our buildings intersecting Collins-street in such a way as we would rather not do. But we could do it. Bourke-street can go without interfering with any buildings; La Trobe-street can go without interfering with any buildings; but Collins-street cannot.

297. Even your own plan contemplates that Collins street shall be partially extended?—Yes, to the extent of the passenger station.

298. Then is there to prevent its going farther, unless it be the existing buildings?—We have a brick shed here.

299. Your present shed?—We ought to have more sheds there.

300. You therefore intend ready to build other sheds, which will prevent the extension of Collins-street?—I did not say anything of the kind.
301. How would you do it then?—Supposing that is the end of a building that might intersect Collins-street, and this is Collins-street here, we can so construct it that the viaduct can go through that building.

302. Then that offers no opposition even to the extension of Collins-street?—Certainly not.

303. I thought you said you would?—I said we would rather not have it, because it would divide our sheds, and then when you consider that Collins-street lets you just upon the gasworks, the gain obtained by that is small.

304. Now, in Bourke-street, how would you cross?—By a viaduct, and very easily.

305. I cannot carry that in my mind. Bourke-street is upon a level with this?—We can give you a section if you like.

306. Can you give the cost in figures?—You may put it down in round figures that every communication you want would cost you £200,000.

307. Is not the level at the junction of Bourke and Spencer-streets very low?—I do not go into the levels. All I know is that I have seen plans and sections showing that it is engineeringly possible.

308. Would it not be very much better if we got the gradiers and sections from the Engineer-in-Chief?—We will put in if you like a section showing the possibility of that viaduct being constructed.

309. Have your officers any sections of the prolongation of Bourke and Collins-streets?—Yes.

310. Are you acquainted with the proposals known as the Fochon proposals?—I have seen them.

311. What do you think of them?—Well, I would not carry them out.

312. You think it would not be a good thing for the community or the city to have them carried out?—The very worst thing to do—thoroughly impracticable.

313. Would your advice be the same in the interests of the public, even if you were not a Railway Commissioner?—Yes, decidedly.; it is a citizen I should not advise it. From my experience—now getting on to close upon 40 years—I have a great objection to a railway company once possessed of land paring with it. I have seen so many instances of a momentary profit being obtained at the cost of a future result, and if they had known it they would have cut their heads off before they would have done it.

314. Do I understand you correctly to say that when you first came a proposition was made by the City Council to take this territory?—No; I said that came as a question to get access to the city to the docks.

315. The City Council have been consistent all through in asking merely for access?—Yes, as a council, I think so.

316. This plan shows the various applications for land. This has been supplied by the Lands Department. The dark-red shows the original grant, the blue as temporarily reserved, and those have been—The 145-acre reserve has been reserved at three times. My answer is that it was all reserved long before I came.

317. This has been given from the Lands Office in the last twelve months, and it is marked as temporarily reserved?—It is merely historical as regards the stages at which this property was taken.

318. I understand it very differently from that. This is a document given by the department that the land coloured blue is land applied for by the Railway Commissioners, but not formerly reserved?—Applied for by the Railway Commissioners?

319. That is how they put it?—The Railway Commissioners did not apply for it. It was in our possession when I came. And very glad we were to find it was so.

320. It is misleading so far as that goes?—It is.

321. What width do you think Flinders-street should be kept if that alone is provided for access at present?—It was agreed between the Harbour Trust and the department what width should be the width. We are proposing to give three chains up.

322. What length?—It makes six acres in the total quantity.

323. Do you propose to give that land free of any charges?—We are not making any charge for the land at all. All we say is, “Pay us for the works disturbed.”

324. Flinders-street at present is a claim and half wide?—Ninety-nine feet.

325. I mean south of your piece of land?—I know that with the piece of land we give up it increased three times.

326. It will make it approximately 264 feet wide. Do you recommend that the whole of that be kept as a road?—I should stipulate that if they do get the land they should keep it as a road; that they did not get the land and then sell it as frontages.

327. Is it 264 feet wide?—I have not the measurement.

328. Do the Railway Commissioners refund anything to the State for the land?—No. We pay into the Treasury all that we earn. They do not let us keep anything.

329. I suppose you contemplate, in any scheme, the widening of that culvert at Dudley-street; that is surely insufficient just now, is it not?—I think it should be made a first-class approach to that yellow piece of ground.

330. But at present it would never do?—We should have no trouble to deal with the city upon that matter.

331. It is evidently the policy of the Railway Commissioners to take as much land as they can obtain free, and give away nothing?—Well, that is rather a rough way of putting it. It is this—I should put it in this way—that we know from our experience that we have not got more land than we want, and we do not like anybody to come and forcibly take it from us.

332. In fact you are simply studying the policy of the railway?—And the public. I cannot separate the two. My biggest customers are the public, and the more facilities I give them the better business I do, and the better results I afford.

333. If a section of the public on the one side thought their interests would be served by your giving up a piece of land, would you be justified in studying that?—Not if that advantage was counterbalanced by the inconvenience to the remainder of the public.

334. You put yourself up to judge upon that point?—I am not putting myself up as anything at all. I am a trustee for the railways, and you ask my opinion and I give it to you.

335. You judge from your particular point of view?—I judge from the best point of view that I can.

337. By the Commission.—Have you examined this scheme for extending the various streets of Melbourne across the railway ground?—I have not seen anything except what I saw in the Argus this morning.

338. That is all?—That is all.

339. What is your opinion as Engineer-in-Chief with regard to the proposition to curtail the present station ground?—I gave some consideration to the matter some years ago—two or three years ago—and I was very much opposed to any portion of the present ground being interfered with, with the exception of the portion required for widening Flinders-street.

340. You do not think the department could give, say, the land south of Collins-street?—I do not think so. I do not see how it is possible.

341. Or Bourke-street?—Nor Bourke-street. I do not know where the station could be put.

342. You think the railway traffic as it is developing will require all the land present in possession of the department?—I am quite sure of it. And it is increasing every day.

343. What method would you propose to give access to the new docks?—I am inclined to think that the widening of Flinders-street would be sufficient, and, if more is required, further accommodation would be given at Dudley-street bridge.

344. Have you thought of the feasibility of extending Collins-street, Bourke-street, or any of the streets by a viaduct over the line?—I have not given any consideration to that. I look upon it as impracticable because I do not see how you are going to get down upon the west side of the station ground. The ground there is much lower than Spencer-street.

345. Have you any idea of the difference in level between, say, the intersection of Collins and Spencer-streets and the wharves and docks?—I should think about 20 feet. But I do not like to guess at a thing like that. I say, without giving much consideration to it, that is about it. Perhaps it may be nearer 15 than 20 feet.

346. Have you not sections in the office?—I have no doubt there are some, but I have had nothing to do with the yard for the last seven years. I am told that there is upon the table a plan showing the difference of level, and this no doubt is reliable.

347. Yes, I have it here. It is about 24 feet between the formation level and the docks. Have you ever seen the scheme known as Mr. Fehon's scheme for concentrating all the passenger traffic at one station? I saw some diagram in the Argus some time ago, but I did not look carefully into the scheme.

348. But you are totally opposed to the curtailment of the present station ground by taking any streets through it at all?—I am.

349. Would there be any objection to the continuation of Collins-street or Bourke-street by a sub-way?—I do not see how you could do that. I forget what the reduced level of the station yard is; I think you would get floods if you attempted a sub-way. I am afraid so.

350. A sub-way would not go below the formation level?—Yes. You would require something like 14 feet clear head way. By a sub-way I mean for days and so on. Do you mean that?

351. Yes, that is what I mean?—Yes, you must have that.

352. Looking at it from a railway point of view, you consider it imprudent to part with any part of the land?—Yes, except the small part I spoke of to widen Flinders-street.

353. Have you considered the possibility of the development of the traffic by the construction of the docks?—No doubt the traffic will increase in time just as it will increase from all other parts of the colony.

354. Do you mean to say, having regard to that, that it is practically impossible to have any communication by any other street of the city than Flinders-street with the docks? Where does Dudley-street lead to?—Victoria-street, does it not?—I think so, or in that direction.

355. Then between Flinders-street on the one side and Dudley-street on the other, which is the better part of two miles, there is no means of getting to the docks?—None, but the distance is less than a mile.

356. Now forget the railways for a moment, and take the interests of the community; is it not advisable to connect any street with the docks other than Flinders and Dudley-streets?—I do not think it is indispensable.

357. You think the traffic of the future will be all accommodated by Flinders-street on the one hand and Dudley-street on the other?—Yes.

358. Even though the road be circuitous?—Yes.

359. Is it possible, in an engineering point of view, to have any communication between the docks and those streets?—I do not see how it is to be done.

360. You say from an engineering point of view it is impossible to have a connection?—I do not say that it is impossible. I do not know that it is impossible to put a bridge at La Trobe-street. The only difficulty is getting down to the level of the docks afterwards.

361. I mean to make it available for commercial work?—It would be enormously expensive and the saving of distance would not be very great over the Dudley-street line.

362. Have you not any sections and plans of the prolongation of Collins and Bourke-streets?—No. I have had nothing to do with the station yard here for the last seven years. That is in the hands of the existing lines branch.

363. We were told that the officers of the department had some plans of the prolongation of Collins and Bourke-streets?—It is possible that the existing lines branch may, but I should know nothing about that. Mr. Long, engineer of existing lines, would be able to give you all the information.

Let me be very clear; do you mean that there is no possible advantage to be gained by the community by having any communication between Flinders and Dudley streets?—As far as that goes, the
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public might ask for half-a-dozen crossings, but I say that, in my opinion, this crossing at Dudley-street and that at Flinders-street would be sufficient.

365. What width is the culvert at Dudley-street?—It would have to be altered and widened.

366. Put a larger communication than there is now?—Put a larger communication than there is now, if necessary.

367. The headway is not sufficient?—I do not know what the headway is, but drays go under.

368. You could not get a high load under, and the road is below the formation?—I do not recollect enough about it to say distinctly.

369. You say Collins-street cannot be extended?—No, not in my opinion.

370. And Bourke-street?—That is worse.

371. Assuming that the present station yard at Spencer-street could be pushed north so that Collins or Bourke-street would represent Flinders-street, and sufficient land were taken in on the north to allow for the space made available on the south, could not the business of the railway be carried on?—It is possible there may be room enough. If you will send into my room for the plan I will show you what was considered necessary some years ago. — *The witness withdrew for a short time and returned with a plan* —This plan was prepared ten years ago, in 1877. It is number 150.

372. The question is, would it be possible to push all these works back to Bourke-street and find accommodation for them in the pink part of the swamp?—At an enormous cost, of course it would be possible.

373. The question is, could the railway be efficiently carried on by pushing it back in that way?—Of course it could be carried on, but whether it would be so convenient to the public or not is another question. As well as I recollect, the ground rises considerably to the north. Of course you can do anything you like if you have the money.

374. Is it practicable to carry that out?—It is possible.

375. Is it desirable?—Certainly not.

376. Would it be judicious from a public point of view?—I am sure it would not. And I do not see any advantage in it whatever; not a single redeeming feature.

377. Would any one be able to produce those sections of the prolongation of Bourke and Collins-streets?—I say, I only believe they are in existence; but Mr. Lunt will be able to tell you. He is the engineer for existing lines.

378. You do not think it would be wise or politic on the part of the department or the Government to part with any part of the present station ground?—That is my opinion.

379. Then you disapprove of the project to push the whole or part of the station back to Bourke-street, or any further north than it is at the present time?—Most decidedly.

380. Do you think it might be necessary, notwithstanding the amount of land the Railway Department has at present even, to purchase land in the future?—I cannot speak upon that, for I have had nothing to do with the Melbourne terminus for the last seven years.

*The witness withdrew.*

John Lunt, Esq., C.E., Engineer of Existing Lines, Victorian Railways, examined.

381. By the Commissioner.—Have you any sections of the prolongation of Bourke-street and Collins-

382. I suppose it is plotted with reference to low-water datum?—I cannot say, I am sure.

383. If it is not plotted with regard to low-water datum, can you give us what are the data in regard to it?—Yes.

384. So as to compare them with the report of the Harbour Trust?—Yes.

385. Do you know of your own knowledge whether it is feasible to take a viaduct over the railways to serve the proposed docks from Bourke or Collins-street or both?—A viaduct can be made for money, but it would cost an immense amount. Anything can be done for money.

386. Is it possible to make a viaduct that would be available for traffic?—I have not seen the sections, and I cannot say till I have seen them.

387. Who can give us that information?—I will endeavour to get it for you by the next day of meeting.

388. If these plans do not exist, could you have a survey made?—I will have a section taken if they are not in existence.

389. From the line of Collins-street, Bourke-street, Lonsdale-street, and La Trobe-street?—Yes.

390. Can you have that ready for us?—Yes. I can have sections prepared in a fortnight.

391. Have you taken this proposition into consideration—the extension of those streets across the railway ground and the absorption of the railway ground for other purposes?—I think myself the station should not be moved from where it is.

392. It ought not?—Certainly not.

393. Could any of the land to the south be given up—south of where we are sitting now?—Certainly not.

394. Is it your opinion that no amount of money, however large, that could be placed at the disposal of the Railway Department to remove the station north of Collins-street, would compensate for the taking away of the ground south of Collins-street?—I do not see where you would get the land to build the station and roads.

395. That does not answer my question, for if you had more money you could concentrate the buildings more, make them more lofty. There is a great waste of land on the land south of Collins-street at present?—The great portion of the land is required for roads and goods sheds.

396. Then your answer to my question would be that no amount of money could compensate for the withdrawal of that land from the Railway Department?—It would not.

397. In other words you want the land, not the money?—Yes.

398. I understand that the land south of Collins-street is likely to be used as a means of connecting with Flinders-street. The diagram Mr. Spalding had showed it was only to be used for that purpose?—And the erection of offices.
399. Upon the western portion of it the goods traffic is at present concentrated?—Yes.
400. Is it necessary to hold the land you have abutting upon Flinders-street for the purpose of wood yards?—Yes.
401. If you take a line from Collins-street over to the gasworks, there is nothing upon that land except firewood yards and a small portion of a goods shed?—You would have to take nearly all the goods shed.
402. Apart from that it is firewood yards?—It is all required—the whole of it.
403. If those yards could be moved to a more central situation, nearer to the consumers of wood, what use would the land be applied to?—It will be used for wood yards.
404. But if the wood yards could be moved?—Timber.
405. Is it part of the railway business to hold land for timber yards and let it for timber yards?—There is timber stacked upon some portion of the land, and firewood.
406. Is it necessary for the railway purposes?—The timber comes by rail.
407. But is it necessary that about 20 or 40 tenants should be there renting land from the railway for the purpose of timber yards. Could not the timber be moved from the railway to various timber yards in the city or suburbs?—I do not suppose it would pay to move it.
408. Then it is necessary for the railway business to keep land for timber yards and firewood yards?—Yes.
409. In the event of large extension of the traffic, would not the land be required for the erection of sheds?—In all probability it would be used for sheds.
410. Is there not great danger of fire from the storage of timber in that particular locality?—No more danger there than in other places I think.
411. Would it not be in very awkward proximity to the gasworks in case of a great conflagration?—No. I do not think the gasworks are any more in danger than any other place.
412. Do I not know whether they are encroaching upon your boundaries, but I noticed that some timber was within a very few yards of the gasworks boundaries some time ago?—Yes, it is.
413. Could not good road communication be given from the north-east corner of the gas company’s property into Flinders-street?—Certainly.
414. You could get good road accommodation there?—Yes.
415. Which would tap the country north of the gas company’s holding?—Yes.
416. As shown upon that plan?—Yes, that road could be given there. It is a road a chain wide at the present time.
417. It is a good site for a wide road to give access to the north of the gasworks property?—Yes.
418. You could get a road two chains wide.
419. Do you know the area of land let by the Railway Department to tenants?—No, I cannot say.
420. Would a road there be a great convenience to traffic from the docks?—Certainly it would, when the docks are completed, but it would not be wanted till they are completed, and that will be many years.
421. Of course we speak of the future?—Yes. Those people who hold leases for wood yards are liable to be turned off at a moment’s notice at any time.
422. Does not the fact that this land is let for firewood yards show that at any rate this land is now at present required for legitimate railway purposes?—It will be wanted, no doubt about it, for goods sheds and other purposes, the whole of it.
423. The access to those goods sheds proposed and the new docks must all come through Flinders-street?—It is not necessary. You can come down Dudley-street, and there is a bridge over at North Melbourne. They can come down there along the south side of the reserve.
424. That would be a very long detour to make to the docks?—Not for the people on the north.
425. But there is no access on the north side of Melbourne for business purposes. A road there would be an advantage, but it would be very little use for merchants and the lorry traffic of the city. It takes it right into the compound?—Some of the people up there could use it.
426. Can you tell the distance between Flinders and Dudley-streets?—About 50 chains.
427. Is not each block 20 chains?—Ten chains.
428. Will you prepare a section showing the grade that would be required to get down to the docks from the viaduct?—Yes.
429. Can you also show how a sub-way could be prepared?—It would be a very difficult thing to make a sub-way. It would be so much below low-water mark.
430. I think there are plans in the department already for sub-ways?—I never saw them.
431. Mr. Woods was telling me to-day that he had them prepared when he was here?—That was only for sub-ways upon the high land, not upon the low land at all.
432. It came under the railway?—Yes.
433. Right to his deck?—No, it was only from one platform to the other. We have plans of them.
434. Then I misunderstood him. I understood him he had made a provision for getting to this portion of land by a sub-way from Collins street?—I never heard of it. There was a sub-way for passengers only from one platform to the other. They went down steps.
435. That is no sub-way for practical purposes of ordinary traffic?—Certainly not.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Thursday the 31st instant, at Two o’clock.
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Robert March 18th.

345. By the Commission.—Can you produce the plans asked for?—Yes.—[The witness produced them.]

346. Will you kindly describe what the plans represent first—plans marked A and B?—A is the plan showing the proposed bridges over Collins-street, in a line with Collins, Bourke, Lonsdale, and La Trobe-streets, with approaches near the docks on the railway ground. B is a similar plan, showing the bridges in a line with the same streets, Collins, Bourke, Lonsdale, and La Trobe-streets, showing the approaches, and near the docks on the Harbour Trust ground; and those others marked C are the sections.

347. Will you shortly describe what is disclosed by those plans—the substance, the levels you have taken?—I think the bridges can be erected on a line with those streets, as shown in those plans.

348. The whole of them?—The whole of them.

349. That is to say, it is an engineering possibility in each case?—Yes. The streets are supposed to be 100 foot wide; the approaches to the docks, grade one in thirty.

350. Those extend right across the ground?—Yes.

351. Are they all the same, or is the grade in some cases less than others?—They are all one in thirty going down to the docks; the approach from Spencer-street is one in twenty.

352. Please start with the southern streets first, Collins-street?—This is the plan of Collins-street—[referring to plan]. The approach from Spencer-street is one in twenty.

353. Could you do the goods traffic on one in twenty?—It depends altogether on the strength put to it; it is rather a stiff grade.

354. Could you name a similar grade in any part of the business portion of Melbourne where traffic goes on?—I suppose one in twenty is the portion of Collins-street opposite the Argus office.

355. One in twenty is the most that can be given?—Yes.

356. And if that is not feasible for the purposes of traffic, there can be no communication there?—No.

357. What is the grade at the West Melbourne swamp end?—One in thirty.

358. That commences from the level of the swamp?—That commences from the level of the swamp.

359. As it now is?—The commencement of some of those approaches is in Woods' dock, and I imagine it to be the surface of the ground.

360. That will be reduced, if there is a filling up of ten feet?—Not very much.

361. Are you aware that the level of the roads which the Harbour Trust proposed to make would be, at least, 8 feet above high water?—This grade is from the ten feet filling.

362. What is the distance of that street where it ends in West Melbourne swamp, a continuation from Flinders-street in the same place?—You can see that better from the plans. This bridge across here is 34 chains long—[pointing to the plan].

363. I mean how much further north is Collins-street than Flinders-street?—Ten chains.

364. Would the traffic, in your opinion, go over a grade of one in twenty to cross here, when it could go ten chains further south and have no grade at all?—Certainly not, it would go right down to the gas works and along on the level.

365. What would it cost?—£160,000.

366. If the bridge be useless for the purpose, as you say, is there any possibility of getting under?—Not any, you would be below the level of the water.

367. You say, as an engineer, if you cannot get over you also cannot get under?—Certainly not.

368. Where do you start in Collins-street; how far to the coast?—About the centre of Spencer-street.

369. How many chains of the twenty-foot grade have you got?—Six chains.

370. You could not afford to bring the ascending gradient further this way, and therefore make it less than one in twenty before you start with the other?—If that was done of course the railway lines would be useless; simply along brick shed, you would have to take the roof off that.

371. Even with your proposition?—Yes.

372. But you need not touch that, if you bring it to this point—[indicating on the plan]?—It would make very little difference.

373. This point is brought to about here—[referring to plan]—then this gradient would be less steep, and would not interfere with that shed at all; what height is it?—Fourteen feet six inches.

374. You have nothing more than the necessary headway?—No.

375. If this line were brought here, would not those rails be levelled somewhat here—[pointing to the plan]—so as to suit that gradient?—You would have to level the whole of the yard.

376. It would also render the connexion with Flinders-street more difficult?—Quite so.

377. What would be the cost of levelling the whole yard be, as against the cost of this bridge?—That is a question I cannot answer. This is 40 feet here and this is 6 chains from there to there—[pointing out the same on the plan].

378. Could you not level a portion of the yard; there is different traffic?—It is different, this is on 28 feet level.

379. What is the distance from Spencer-street to the commencement of the goods shed?—Seven chains and a half.
470. Then it is 496 feet from this point—[referring to the plan]—where it commences?—Yes.
471. What is the difference of level between this point and that—[again referring to the plan]?—It
is not given here; it is about one in twenty-two.
472. I understand the section you have before you is that showing the section of Collins-street?—
Yes.
473. What would be the gradient required to connect Collins-street in a practicable way with the
docks?—The question is what gradient is required; is it one in thirty or one in forty.
474. What is the least gradient you can adopt in getting from the one point to the other?—We
have one in twenty gradients in the city at the present time.
475. What is the distance between the extension of Collins-street and the extension of Flinders-
street?—Ten chains.
476. Seeing this grade that you mentioned is so severe, is not the small distance sufficient to tempt
persons, notwithstanding the extension of Collins-street, from still using the Flinders-street mode of access?
—Yes, I think they would still use Flinders-street for heavy traffic.
477. If Collins-street were bridged by this gradient?—All the heavy traffic would go round.
478. And Collins street would be useless for heavy traffic?—Yes.
479. You have shown here on your plan that you do not propose to continue Collins-street—that, in
fact, you cannot do so on account of the gas works, and you turn alongside of the gas works, that plan
would show that, from the bottom of that ramp—[pointing to the plan]—it is actually nearer to come by
way of Flinders-street?—Yes.
480. There is the only way in which that could be done?—There is another plan showing
another way—[pointing to the same, plan B was referred to.] The Collins-street bridge goes in a straight
line with the street for a certain distance, and then turns to the right alongside of the gas works to
avoid passing along the gas works properly.
481. Is it over head to the railway?—Yes.
482. This—[pointing to the plan]—is the alternative mode of crossing Collins-street?—Yes.
483. What is the gradient of Collins-street, as shown in plan B?—One in 30 on the one side and
one in 20 on the other.
484. The bridges are the same?—They are all the same.
485. You know the character of the traffic that is expected to go over those bridges?—Yes.
486. Which of those two plans do you recommend as the best for the purpose?—Plan B is the best.
487. In what respect does it differ from the other, to make it better?—Because it is nearly in a straight
line—the two bridges, they have not to turn in this at right angles as the other has.
488. In fixing upon 1 in 20 as the gradient, you say you have done it because that is the gradient of
the other streets in Melbourne?—I said nothing of the sort, I said there were higher gradients in
Melbourne.
489. You say that is the best gradient that can be got for the traffic from the docks?—It is 1 in 30
from the docks.
490. Cannot this gradient be improved by bringing the terminal point of it nearer to the shed?
Certainly it could.
491. There is no insuperable difficulty in doing that?—It will spoil the connexion with Flinders-
street.
492. Would you have height at the present level of the railway yard for permitting that?—Yes.
493. You would not require to lower it?—Not with that section.
494. If you alter this grade of 1 in 20 at the point it strikes the level of the bridge, bringing it
further to the west, you would require to lower the Spencer-street station?—Yes.
495. Would not that also involve a greater difficulty with your connexion with Flinders-street?
Certainly it would.
496. You say if you lowered the gradient it would interfere with the lines that would have to pass
under it?—Yes.
497. What is the fall from the point of the crossing of these lines to Flinders-street?—I cannot tell
you.
498. Could they not be lowered under the lowered gradient of Collins-street, and not interfere with
the traffic still?—If they lower those rails they interfere with the loop-line going round to the other station.
499. What is the difference of the level of Collins-street and Flinders-street, at Spencer-street, as
they exist at present?—Twenty-two feet.
500. Would that be any too much for the traffic under the railway when you have the connexion?
No, not say.
501. You said there were streets in Melbourne with gradients of 1 in 20?—Yes, I believe so.
502. Which are they?—I should say Market-street was 1 in 20.
503. Another one?—I should think a portion of William-street is 1 in 20.
504. You are not sure of that?—I am not sure of any.
505. Those streets are not used for heavy traffic, loaded trains?—I think not very much.
506. Practically then, if you made it 1 in 20 there, heavily loaded teams could not use it profitably?
—They would go round the other way.
507. There is a little doubt in our minds as to the connexion of the lines that run between Spencer-
street and Flinders-street stations; if the grade was lowered it would interfere with the proposed line of the
viaduct?—Yes; it would interfere with the line, but you would have to lower the height.
508. It would involve the lowering of the yard, or the pushing of that viaduct further over, nearer
to the gasworks; you could get the grade then up to that point?—Yes, you could.
509. What would the pushing of this—[pointing to the plan]—towards the westward involve with
your passenger traffic?—It would involve altering the greater portion of the lines; those lines are here, all
would have to be altered.
510. What is the difference in the level between your present rails and the ten feet line upon which
you base your calculations?—Twenty-two feet.
511. Then, after allowing ten feet above the present height, altogether you have still 22 feet to
work on?—Yes.
512. Would there not be nearly enough head room to go under there?—You see you would have to get a sub-way where the ten feet level is, therefore you would be considerably below the level of the water in the Yarra.
513. I speak of the difference of the level of your lines and your level?—If you made a sub-way it would be below the water in the Yarra, and you could not, in my opinion, keep it dry.
514. Would it be as great as in the other case?—I believe it would; in fact, it would be as bad coming out of the sub-way as going over the bridge.
515. The regulations are 15 feet for the engine height; is 15 feet the height for the bridges?—Yes.
516. And about 16 feet for the under bridges?—Yes.
517. That would be practically the same grade, to get 16 feet headway, or to go under, to get head way for the engine underneath?—You would have to commence half-way along here—[pointing to the plan]—and Flinders-street.
518. That would involve lowering of the whole of Spencer-street?—Yes.
519. Do I form a right conclusion from your evidence that, practically, a bridge may be said to be out of the question, and a sub-way, an impossibility—it is either moving the station or nothing?—What I mean is, if the bridge can be erected as shown there with those grades, it might be eased a little, but not much.
520. Then the bridge is not practicable, and the sub-way impossible?—I do not say it is impossible.
521. They are both impracticable?—I could not recommend the sub-way being erected.
522. And you do not care about the bridge?—I do not mind about the bridge, it is the people who would mind.
523. For the purposes of heavy traffic, such as we may expect to pass from one side to the other, you say that a bridge with that gradient is impracticable?—I say I do not believe the people would use the bridge; they would use Flinders-street in preference.
524. Then that is out of the question; then, with regard to the sub-way, your objection is even more forcible?—Yes.
525. Then having those two objections, it is either the station to be removed or nothing?—They can go round Flinders-street.
526. I mean so far as Collins-street is concerned; I am confining myself to Collins-street?—I should certainly say the station should not be removed.
527. The idea of pushing Collins-street through would have to be abandoned?—Yes.
528. Or the station removed?—No, or the people go round by Flinders-street.
529. Although heavy traffic to and from the docks would not pass along a gradient of 1 in 20, in your opinion, would not a considerable portion of the lighter traffic pass along such a grade?—Certainly it would.
530. Are you aware that in Bourke street, west of Elizabeth-street, the gradient is much steeper than 1 in 20?—I am not aware of that. I know it is very steep.
531. And there is a good deal of heavy traffic along it?—Yes.
532. Could you inform us what is the difference between the level of the rails, say here at the station, Spencer-street, and the centre of Flinders-street?—Twenty-two feet, that is on plan B.
533. And Flinders-street is not below the river level?—No.
534. Then the road way in Collins-street, and in a line with the other, would not be below the river level?—No; there is a portion of this line which is only 10 feet, only one foot above Flinders-street.
535. You are speaking of the passenger lines only?—Yes; when you get down there you get lower and lower.
536. These plans, I suppose, we take with the present levels of the rails now in work?—Yes, a section of the grounds.
537. Is it possible to lower the whole of those rails down, say 4 feet or 6 feet, and thereby ease the grade of the bridges—make them so much lower?—You would have to close Dudley-street if you did; we want to lift it instead of going down.
538. That is the objection to lowering the yards?—Yes.
539. And there would be an objection on the ground of cost?—It would be very costly.
540. You cannot form any idea?—No.
541. Would not it be impossible to drain them so low as 4 feet?—No, they could drain.
542. That is for some lines, but others are only 1 foot above Flinders-street?—Yes.
543. Therefore they could not be drained?—No.
544. As to Bourke-street, what is the result of your investigations as to levels? Is the gradient more favorable from Bourke-street than Collins-street?—No, it is exactly the same—1 in 20 from Bourke-street up to the railway.
545. Would the same objections that you have stated with regard to the over-way or sub-way as to Collins-street, apply to Bourke-street?—Exactly similar in all cases.
546. What is the difference of Bourke-street from Flinders-street?—Twenty-one chains; ten chain blocks.
547. Do you think the traffic would still go round Flinders-street rather than go through Bourke-street, if a bridge were there?—I think there would be a large amount of traffic at this bridge, but the next one is the better one.
548. What is the distance from Spencer-street at the bottom of Bourke-street across the station yard to the head of the proposed dock?—Thirty-seven chains.
549. Would that be the length of the proposed bridge?—With approaches?
550. Can you tell me, assuming any one coming down Bourke-street, and wanting to get to the head of the docks, and having to go down round by Flinders-street by the gasworks as proposed, what distance would be have to travel to reach the same point?—Three times as far. But I might say they would not go that way, because there is a road here—[pointing to the plan].
551. Because there is a road that will branch off from Flinders-street, past Mr. Williams' coach factory, up to the head of the dock?—It is a road now.
552. Do you speak with authority, that the railway authorities propose to make such a road?—It is a road now.
553. Then there is no such road as that?—There is a road there even now at the present time; this is the road I was referring to—[pointing to the plan].

554. Does that go round the back?—It will.

555. Do you say the Railway department propose, as part of the scheme, to reserve a road leading from Flinders-street past Williams' coach factory on through the head of the proposed dock to Dudley-street?—I am not aware that they are going to do so.

556. Assuming there is no such means of access, you say the distance from Bourke-street to the head of the dock will be three times greater if there be no access straight across?—It will.

557. If they have to leave from the same point in Bourke-street, to get to the north side of the dock by Dudley-street, what distance will they have to go to get there?—I cannot tell you.

558. About—have you any idea?—About four times as far.

559. What is the estimated cost of the bridge on the extension of Bourke-street?—£210,000.

560. It is more expensive than the prolongation of Collins-street?—Yes.

561. What would the Collins-street cost?—£160,000.

It was a very important one.on the difference of distance between reaching the western portion of the dock from Bourke-street, assuming Bourke-street to be extended, and having to reach it either by Flinders-street or Dudley-street. Can you give any more information about that—the difference in distance?—I can supply it.

562. You said, I think, that you believed there would be a large amount of traffic in Bourke-street if the railway was bridged over. What is your reason for so believing, because you believe there would not be any heavy traffic in Collins-street?—I do not know about heavy traffic, but there would be a great amount, because they would have to go for distance.

563. £500,000 would be spent on two bridges that would not be used for heavy traffic?—Yes.

564. Would you tell us why the Bourke-street bridge is so much more expensive than the other?—It is longer.

565. It is shown on the plan as going right into the excavation—could not that be avoided?—This is into what is called Woods' dock. This blue tint—[pointing to the plan]—is supposed to be the dock that was going to be made.

566. You are speaking of the heavy traffic. May we not expect that when the docks are completed there will be warehouses round them, and heavy goods will go to a great extent be left there and taken direct up the country, and not require to be carted through the streets?—Most of the heavy goods will go from those docks by railway wagons. There will be rails laid along Flinders-street and lines going here, there, and everywhere.

567. Then the cartage will not be so much?—No.

568. What is required for the city will require to be carted, the bulk of it?—Yes.

569. There is a large warehouse now in Bourke-street, Richard Goldbrugh and Co. They are large dealers in produce, and all the goods that they would have to send to ship would require to go by either of those bridges or round by the wharf, if they wish to ship them by the docks?—I suppose so.

570. Do you still adhere to your opinion at the last meeting, that the department could not relinquish any of the land, even if you bridged over Collins-street and Bourke-street. You do not contemplate parting with a single inch of railway land?—Nothing beyond the six acres at Flinders-street.

571. You could not give up any portion of the narrow strip between Flinders-street and Collins-street?—Not any.

572. At present all the traffic passes through a street thirty-three feet wide?—It does.

573. As to a street by the gas works, there is such a street?—Yes.

574. That street is the only way of access to Mr. Williams' property?—Yes, it will undoubtedly go to the dock.

575. Can you explain on plan B what this wide strip is here for?—It is not for the extension of Flinders-street?—No, there are lines going down there—[pointing to the plan].

576. Railway lines?—Railway lines.

577. They are not shown?—No, that is the way they go to the Sale line.

578. Would it be at all possible to carry on the railway traffic north of Bourke-street?—It is not for one to say; the General Treasurer can speak of that better. I myself consider there is not an inch too much land there at the present time.

579. Does that include the swamp?—Yes.

580. If the railway department was deprived of this land, I understood Mr. Speight to say, they would have to purchase property north of Bourke-street?—Yes.

581. You seem to say the Railway department cannot afford to lose an inch of ground; but, supposing other ground were substituted for the ground lost, would that interfere with the railway traffic practically, is it not only that it would have to be carried on at another spot?—Of course the railway could be carried on, if you carried it out of Melbourne altogether; but there is a certain area of ground most suitable for carrying out all sorts of work in this piece here, and you cannot show anywhere about here in the dock or there, you could not go there—[pointing to the plan].

582. Is your estimate of the area of ground required for railway purposes, do you take into account the 35 acres which have been recently vested in the Railway Commissioners, situated in Hotham?—Yes, that is taken into consideration.

583. Do you know the dimensions of the principal railway stations through England?—No, I could not tell you that.

584. Has any plan been prepared showing the purposes to which the Commissioners intend to adapt these several pieces of land that have been reserved?—A plan has been prepared showing what they are going to do with some of these, not the whole of them.

585. I can quite understand your saying you want all the land, but I want to know the purposes you want to apply it to. *A* is the present station, *B* is the West Melbourne swamp, *C* is the Hotham piece of land—[drawing a diagram]. Now, have you a plan showing the future uses of those blocks?—Yes, B—all that is covered with sheds.
A is to be retained for the station purposes?—Yes.

B is to be used for the purpose of what?—Engines, coal stations, and coal.

And where are those?—Here—[pointing to the plan].

Where is the traffic being carried on?—Along here—[pointing to the plan].

Then it is to be removed from the station?—Yes.

Am I to understand that all the sheds that are now lying to the eastward are to be moved over to B?—The engine-sheds are to be moved, and the coal gears.

What is to become of the Custom sheds bordering on Spencer-street?—They are to be removed down here towards the gasworks.

And then C—this part marked C—is what that for?—To accommodate Hotham—wood sidings, and all sorts of produce.

Then the wood business that is conducted down near the gasworks is to be removed to C, towards Hotham—A portion of it.

What is to be done with the balance?—Part will remain near Flinders-street.

This is the plan—this yellow is still the swamp land.* The yellow is still unused—assuming that is to be used for any commercial purpose whatever, will you tell me what means of access there will be for the commercial community of Melbourne to get to that yellow part?—They can come over here—[pointing to the plan].

Is not the only means of access to that yellow portion under what is known as the North Melbourne bridge?—And Dudley-street.

How do they get to the the yellow?—They come through here—[pointing to the plan].

Is not that reserved for the Railway department; now supposing that the soft-goods people in Flinders-lane want to get to some place in the yellow, what way could they go—what way would you go?—I should take a boat.

Then the mercantile community who want to get to this portion must go by a boat?—That or by North Melbourne.

There is no other means of access than those two?—There is Dudley-street.

At the present moment have not the Railway Commissioners had these lands so reserved that the mercantile community have no access to the yellow?—I think that is a question for the chairman, Mr. Speight, not for me.

Is it not a fact?—I say, they can go by water or by Dudley-street.

Is the land there reserved?—I do not suppose they would object to access being given through it.

How can people get across the reserve—is it a fact that the Railway department have reserved all the frontage of Dudley-street between that 700 acres that lie to the west?—[No answer.]

Do you think the Railway department would object to that being thrown into Dudley-street for road purposes?—No.

It would not affect the railway at all?—No.

Then the whole of that strip down to the yellow can be given up?—I cannot say; I do not know what the intention is.

Are you aware of any objection to roads being put through that pink—[pointing to the plan].—if it were a public convenience that they should be put through?—The only thing I know about is, they propose widening the canal through to the engine sheds for coaling purposes.

And that is the purpose of that reservation you call the pink?—It was intended for that, no doubt.

To increase the canal and bring the traffic there?—Yes.

That is a continuation of Collins-street; if that piece of land to the south of Collins-street was given up by the Railway department, and an equal area of land given to them on the west side of the station yard, would the traffic arrangements be materially affected by it?—Certainly they would; in the first place they could not get here—[pointing to the plan].

Suppose you did get an equal area, as I mention?—I would recommend it not to be done.

Could the business of the railway yards be carried on then?—I cannot say.

Would not that proposal, if carried out, interfere with the Coode's dock scheme?—Yes, and the Harbour Trust scheme, what they propose doing.

If the Harbour Trust were agreeable to give up a portion of their land on that plan, would it not be a great assistance to the railway people?—So far as I am concerned about the matter I certainly would not give one inch about there for those; it does not lie so well.

Still that would be a great addition to the railway yard?—I do not know that it would.

Now the next street, Lonsdale-street; is the gradient more favourable there?—Just the same.

And the same difficulty as to the bridge?—Yes, the same exactly.

And the cost of the bridge?—£195,000.

You said when speaking of Bourke-street that the circumstances surrounding the Lonsdale street bridge were more favorable than the circumstances surrounding the Bourke-street one—in what respect?—I ought to have said La Trobe-street.

The La Trobe-street one is more favorable than any of the others?—Yes.

What will be the cost of the La Trobe-street extension?—£124,000. La Trobe-street is practically level. It goes on to the bridge almost level, and I in 30 down to the dock.

How much is that altogether?—£177,000.

Supposing it was decided to carry out one of these bridges, which would you recommend to be carried out?—The La Trobe-street.

Is that the one that would divide up the country between Dudley-street and Flinders-street best?—No, it would not.

It would be nearer to Dudley-street than Flinders-street?—Yes.

But notwithstanding that fact you would recommend it in preference?—Yes. The approach is so much better, and it is not so costly.

If that bridge were made would it be used for the heavy traffic?—Yes, a great portion would come up here from a number of stores.

* see footnote, page 11.
631. The heavy traffic to the dock would cross that bridge?—Yes.
632. Do you mean, that you think the heavy traffic would go up Queen-street or Spencer-street in order to reach that bridge rather than go the level road to the docks?—If they are in the neighbourhood, and reach the level, and go down 1 in 30.
633. How far is east from Dudley-street?—Twenty chains.
634. That would serve all the north part of the city?—Yes.
635. I understand that the Railway department has a plan, or some scheme for very much altering the accommodation of the office, and so on. In the production of Collins-street, does that materially interfere with the plan in the department of new offices and station?—It is intended to build the new offices on the south side of Collins-street.
636. But would the extension of Collins-street interfere with any building according to the present plan?—If the station was moved it would.
637. How would the Bourke-street extension effect buildings proposed to be erected?—The present ones would have to be taken down.
638. Would the proposed one be interfered with?—We would not have the ground to build them on.
639. Would you have to modify your plans, therefore, for increasing the accommodation?—I do not think there is any definite plan fixed on.
640. The adoption of rising gradients from Collins-street would not be an insuperable objection to the proposed new buildings being erected?—I do not know that it would.
641. Do you know what the gradient of Spencer-street is from Flinders-street, at the intersection of Spencer-street and La Trobe-street, where the level bridge is?—The gradient from Collins-street to La Trobe-street is 1 in 100 rising from Collins-street, a distance of 34 chains.
642. From Collins-street to Flinders-street?—From Collins-street to Flinders-street the gradient is 1 in 34 rising from Flinders-street, a distance of 11 chains.
643. Do you think that the production of La Trobe-street by bridge over the railway will give better accommodation to the West Melbourne swamp than the production of the other streets—Bourke, Collins, and Lansdale-streets?—The most central will be La Trobe-street.
644. Would the production of La Trobe-street give better access to this—[pointing to the plan]?—Yes. It is more central.
645. Is there any difficulty at all in making Dudley-street thoroughly serviceable for all sorts of traffic?—Not any difficulty.
646. The bridge is sufficiently high, and there is no difficulty in making it suitable?—The bridge would have to be re-built.
647. And you could make it the full width of the street?—Yes.
648. What headway would there be underneath it, and above the 10 feet level?—I suppose they could have 15 feet.
649. Are you sure of that?—I think so. I would not be certain—[looking at the plan]—13 or 14 feet.
650. If Flinders-street was widened to the full width, as proposed, and a bridge put over at La Trobe-street, and Dudley-street improved, you think that would give sufficient access to the docks and West Melbourne swamp for a considerable time?—For a number of years.
651. Would that access be good access in your opinion?—It would.
652. You would not be put to much inconvenience in reaching those points or bringing traffic to or from?—No, they would have very good accommodation.
653. For how many years?—That is a point impossible to say.
654. With a steady growth of the place, if there was an increase, what would people do then?—They could do it then as well as now.
655. I did not understand you that any buildings are to be put across the streets?—I am not aware of any.
656. The station will face the short extension of Collins street?—Yes.
657. The access to the swamp, would that be through the docks?—Down Dudley-street.
658. The following that up, would not, in your opinion, the access now proposed from the extension of Flinders-street and La Trobe-street be ample for all time, as far as the docks are concerned?—I cannot say.
659. Is the railway traffic not likely to grow in the same ratio as other traffic?—I should say more so, probably.
660. If it does grow is it not being distributed to suburban stations—in North Carlton and various places?—Everything comes to Melbourne in the first place. Almost all the traffic from up the main roads comes to Melbourne, and is sent away up to those other places.
661. Two thirds of the traffic of the colony comes into the station?—Fully. that.
662. I referred just now to Flinders-street, the widening of that street, also to the bridge over La Trobe-street, and the improvement of Dudley-street; and in addition to that, would not the bridge at North Melbourne, recently constructed, give very considerable and constant access to what is known as the West Melbourne swamp?—It would be of very little use; they would not be able to get to it.
663. The land coloured yellow is the land at the present time in the hands of the Crown, not reserved for railway purposes. The question is, whether the main means of access to that yellow will not be over the North Melbourne bridge?—I think not, and Dudley-street.
664. What is the gradient at the North Melbourne bridge?—I could not tell you at the present moment.
665. It is a heavy gradient?—About 1 in 30.
666. Do you mean on that portion next the Footscray-road?—Yes.
667. Can you inform the Commission of the gradient from the Dudley-street bridge up to the intersection of Spencer-street?—I can get it.
668. It is a heavy one?—I should say it is 1 in 25 a portion of the way.
669. If it is to be one of the main means of access to the new ground and the docks, evidently the gradient objection applies also in regard to that street?—It is a heavy grade.
670. Particularly between Adderley-street and Spencer-street, is it a very heavy grade?—Yes.

Melbourne Extension.
671. By the Commission.—You are one of the Railway Commissioners?—Yes.

672. You have been a long time connected with the Railway department?—Yes.

673. How many years?—Upwards of thirty years.

674. You have an intimate knowledge of the requirements of the department and its development?—Yes.

675. Have you heard the proposal to extend the various streets of Melbourne westward, across the present station ground?—Yes.

676. Do you think that the Railway department would give up some of the land it at present holds for the purposes of making that extension?—I do not think we can afford to give up any of the land, except sufficient to widen Flinders-street.

677. You do not think the department could give all the land, say south of the alignment of Collins-street?—I do not think so.

678. What is your reason for so thinking?—Because we cannot get an equivalent elsewhere that will give the same accommodation to the Railway department and the public.

679. What are you using the land for now?—For goods sidings, part of it for timber sidings, and it is only used for timber sidings pending the construction of goods sheds; we propose to put the bulk of the timber traffic at North Melbourne and utilize the lower level sidings now occupied by timber traffic and firewood traffic for ordinary goods purposes.

680. You say you could give up some land for the purpose of widening Flinders-street?—Yes.

681. What would be the use of the frontages then?—We would use the frontage for the lower level.

682. The new frontage to Flinders-street?—Yes, for access to the goods sheds.

683. What would you use the Spencer-street frontage for?—We propose to use that for the departmental offices.

684. Could not other places be in some other position, without using so valuable a frontage as that?—Not on any other ground we have got.

685. Is it absolutely necessary that the offices should be placed there?—There is another alternative; that is to put them as a second and third story over our main passenger station.

686. Is there no other ground that you can utilize for office accommodation besides that?—Not within the area at present in our possession.

687. Could not the offices be built farther along Spencer-street north?—No; we shall want that for hydraulic machinery, gas works, and works connected with the station probably, and engine-sheds.

688. Will those offices occupy the whole of that frontage?—Nearly.

689. Is the frontage available from Collins-street to the corner of Flinders-street?—It is not available as far as the corner of Collins-street, not within a hundred feet of it, we shall want that for other purposes, to get to the goods sheds.

690. Your new station will form the extension of Collins-street on its northern side?—Yes, the passenger station.

691. And your offices are on the southern side of the extension of Collins-street extending down Spencer to Flinders-street?—Yes.

692. Will all that be occupied by offices?—Not all, because we must have access to No. 1 Goods shed on the other side of it.

693. Suppose Collins-street were extended right through, how would it affect the position of the Railway department?—We could not carry Collins-street right through upon the present level of Spencer-street without abandoning the ground for railway purposes between Collins-street and Flinders-street.

694. In abandoning that ground, you would abandon the site for the proposed goods sheds?—Yes, we might keep the offices, because there is not necessarily a railway connexion between the offices and the street; but the site on the lower level would be of no use because we could not carry the rails through.

695. Have you seen the proposal to extend the lines of railway round to Flinders-street, the Hobson's Bay station, and make it the central passenger station?—Yes.

696. What is your opinion of that project?—I think it is altogether impracticable.

697. Suppose that Collins-street were extended through the gas works, and the Railway department had therefore to relinquish the land south of Collins-street, would the department necessarily have to seek for land elsewhere, in order to compensate for the area taken?—Yes.

698. Where would you have to get it from?—Between La Trobe, Spencer, and Rosslyn-streets, or Stanley-street.—[pointing to the plan].

699. Please describe it?—We should have to go as far as Roden-street on the north, and the extension of Spencer-street, and take in the blocks between Alderley-street and Spencer-street, and between La Trobe-street and Roden-street.

700. You would have to take private property?—Yes.

701. And close up several streets, would you not?—Yes, we would do so.

702. How many streets would you close, suppose you took the amount of land you say would be necessary to compensate you for the loss of the land south of you—how many of the streets now running west of Spencer-street would you have to close up?—La Trobe-street, and Jeffcott-street, and Franklin-street, west of Spencer-street.

703. Leaving Dudley-street open?—Leaving Dudley-street open.

704. About what area of land do you say is comprised within those blocks?—About 32 acres, that is what we should have to take.

705. And how much land would you be giving up south of Collins-street?—The same.

706. And I suppose that land would not be in so favourable a position for the railway service as keeping the land south of Collins-street?—I do not think so.

707. In order to open Collins-street you would be obliged to take land that would close three other streets?—Yes, west of Spencer street; in fact, we would take the land, streets, houses and all.

708. Have you gone into the question of communication by the extension of any of these streets by an over-way to the proposed docks?—It is quite possible to do so.
709. Have you gone into the question of sections?—Yes. When I was engineer of existing lines, I had sections made to show the possibility of extending Bourke-street, Collins-street, and La Trobe-street over the railway.

710. Which of those extensions is the least objectionable?—The La Trobe-street extension.

711. Why?—Because it starts from a higher level and there would be less difficulty, and a shorter viaduct, and it will give more direct access to available land in the West Melbourne swamp.

712. Have you considered the subject of an under-way with regard to any of those streets?—Yes.

713. What is your opinion on that point?—An under-way is impossible, for this reason that we should have to go below the flood-level, and the sub-way would be liable to be flooded; we could have a sub-way in Collins street as far as the goods sheds at the lower level, but beyond that it is impossible, we should have to come to the level of the rails, and the firewood sidings could not go over that.

714. Would the La Trobe-street extension be as good access to the docks as the proposed Collins-street extension?—I think so, and better, because the Collins-street extension goes right against the gas works wall.

715. It need not necessarily go in a straight line?—Well then you might as well extend Bourke-street; of course you can make an alteration of the line of Collins-street to get beyond it, but it is not so good.

716. If a very large sum of money could be obtained by the sale of those 32 acres of land south of Collins-street, a very large sum indeed, would you feel inclined to modify your opinion as to the advisability of the Railway department parting with it?—I do not think so; I think it would be a public inconvenience.

717. Suppose you could get three millions of money for it, would that lead you to say, "Well, we will modify our plan, so as to obtain that money"?—I think not, I think the more money we get for that land now, the more we should have to pay to get it back in a few years.

718. It is contemplated, I understand, to move what is called the Customs shed from here—[pointing to the plan]?—Yes.

719. Also to move the engine shed from here—[pointing to the plan]?—Yes.

720. To what purpose is it intended to apply that land, or the land on which those sheds now stand?—We propose to put carriage sheds, machinery for electric lighting, and machinery for hydraulic working of the stations.

721. Assuming in this plan, that you push it forward on the land that you would take up or purchase, would be applied to what the land would be used for here, if you were not disturbed?—Yes.

722. Would it materially affect the working of the station in any way if the hydraulic machinery was put on the block marked B, and the machinery for the electric lighting on the same; in fact what you propose to put on this block, could it be accommodated on this block—[pointing to the plan]?—Not so well.

723. It could be?—It could be; it would require a great deal more expense; the one is an artificial foundation, and the other is a natural. As regards those two, electric lighting and hydraulic machinery, and as regards carriage sheds, that is the most suitable place for them, the most of that room will be devoted to that.

724. Simply, when that ground is built on, you would have to buy land and to apply to the purpose it would be applied to if it was not taken from you?—The difficulty of utilizing land there is that the land between Addison-street and Bourke-street, and between La Trobe-street and Dudley-street is 28ft. higher than the surface of the rails.

725. Then, assuming that the block called D was in your possession, to utilize it you would have to excavate?—Yes.

726. Would not the cost of that be a set off as against the cost of foundations on block B?—Yes, but we do not want to excavate; it is not necessary to excavate, we have land already excavated.

727. I assume it was purchased for carriage-sheds—you would have to?—Yes, then we should have to excavate, that would add to the cost of the carriage-sheds.

728. But I would assume that you move off "D" and go on to B with your electric lighting?—Yes, then the cost of excavating D would add materially to the cost of the carriage-sheds, to the electric lighting, and the hydraulic machinery.

729. But I understand that the hydraulic and electrical machinery could be accommodated on block B?—Yes.

730. Then it only refers to the carriage-sheds?—Yes.

731. And that is all that is necessary, that you should purchase for carriage-sheds?—That we should purchase for passenger carriage accommodation. All the passenger traffic goes to Spencer-street, or will do as soon as we can transfer the goods to the other side. The present inconvenience is caused by the Customs sheds and the Williamstown traffic being taken over to that side, and it is an inconvenience attended with a certain risk, and we intend to move it to the lower level so as to have no goods traffic crossing the line on the east side.

732. If it were determined to extend Collins-street, and keep all the station, passengers, and goods north of Collins-street, you would give up an area of ground equal to 32 acres?—Yes.

733. If you were supplied with an equal area of ground on the Harbour Trust land, would that materially affect the working of the yard?—It would affect the working of the yard, but not so seriously as if we had to move there. If we went west, instead of north, the difficulty might be got over; we are obliged to go north, because of our sidings. We would have to get in here—[pointing to the plan]—if this was a blank sheet of paper, and did not belong to the Harbour Trust; it would remove some of the difficulty, but it would be a mistake, I believe, to give up this land.

734. As to the disadvantage of getting this Harbour Trust land, and using it instead of the land south of Collins-street, would it be compensated by the amount of money, if that land were sold and devoted to railway purposes?—That is a matter for the Harbour Trust to say.
735. Assuming you have got the money that that land would reallocate south of Collins-street, would it compensate for the inconvenience it might cause the railways?—No, it would not; by our present arrangement, Collins-street would be a purely passenger street, and Flinders-street will be entirely a goods street, whereas, by keeping to this street alone, you would drive both the passengers and goods traffic into Collins-street; I simply pointing to the plan—we have the advantage of having the half tending to Collins-street, and the remaining half tending to Flinders-street.

736. Is it proposed to open these streets for goods traffic?—Yes; but you must come to this, that the goods traffic between No. 1 shed and the gas works will meet the passenger traffic between No. 1 shed and here—we are pointing to the plan.

737. If Collins-street was an inclined street from Spencer-street on to this level?—So it will be. The passenger traffic on the higher level would not mix in the western portion of Collins-street?—It would be possible to do this—to keep the passenger traffic upon the present passenger level, and then to keep those on the lower level, and go out that way; but, still, it would be a less complete arrangement than that now proposed.

738. The great object of the City Council is to endeavour to get the extension of the streets, and if an equivalent of land could be found to the westward, with compensation for the inconvenience by the cash for the land sold to the southward, would it not be worth while to study the convenience of the city?—No doubt it would. I can say you have pointed out the best means of mitigating the evil, that is all I can say; but there would be an undoubtedly evil by putting the passengers and goods traffic into one narrow street leading into Collins-street.

739. We provide two streets for the traffic?—Nevertheless, they come out to front Spencer-street, within a short distance of each other; all the traffic going north would naturally go that way.

740. What is the rail level at the Dudley-street crossing, and the formation level?—You mean the Dudley-street under subways would be insufficient?

741. I ask you because I thought it was misread by Mr. Lunt?—The lower level is a ten-foot level, the upper level I do not remember now; but it is indicated on the plan as eight feet, and it would be insufficient, but it can be so arranged as to give sufficient. I agree that this part of our plan is to improve Dudley-street as far as traffic to the west is concerned.

742. How?—By raising the railway.

743. It is from 10 to 18 feet now?—We have 8ft. 6in., the level upon which to put our ballast, then, if we raise it 6 or 9 feet more, we could give sufficient headway for ordinary purposes. Ultimately, when it becomes a necessity, we propose to carry La Trobe-street over the railway.

744. Did I understand you to say that you had previously considered the expediency of providing access to this dock site?—Yes.

745. And have you drawn plans showing that?—No; the only plan was for widening Fliinders-street, and making a sketch to ascertain whether it is possible to get over La Trobe-street, and whether it is possible to raise the line at Dudley-street. We thought that sufficient.

746. You have considered at some time or other the practicability of crossing Collins-street or Bourke-street before you were a Railway Commissioner?—Yes, how it could be done.

747. And you did cause plans to be prepared to see whether the thing was feasible?—Yes.

748. Have you those plans still?—I think they can be got. I think Mr. Lunt was to produce them—the cross sections of the streets.

749. No, I want the plans you prepared before you were a Railway Commissioner?—I dare say they are in the office; I have not had control of them.

750. There were plans?—Yes, sketches.

751. Are they existing?—Yes.

752. Did you make a report?—No, I do not think so; I will show the one you refer to, the one marked B, I think.

753. Have you always been of opinion heretofore that it was practicable to cross in the way suggested?—I did not think it was practicable to cross overhead.

754. I am told that really you did at one time entertain a different opinion from what you hold now?—No, I simply said that it is quite possible to extend Collins-street at its present level over the goods shed on the other level.

755. You never submitted to the department any written report on the feasibility of connecting the dock site with the city?—No, I have no recollection of it.

756. Of of having prepared any plan showing the practicability or impracticability?—I was asked by Mr. Bent to prepare a plan showing how far it was possible to extend Collins-street without interfering with the railway, and I prepared a plan, and the weak point of that is—

757. Is it in existence?—Yes, I will show it you, it is a lithographed plan; there are two or three plans. The fatal objection to that was, that it was necessary to cross the Flinders-street viaduct on the level, and, for that, that plan would have been perfectly practicable to carry on Collins-street at the present level and come down with an easy gradient to the dock. That is the only plan I prepared—that necessitated the level crossing of the viaduct connecting Spencer-street, and that is a fatal objection.

758. I suppose you admit there will be a large traffic developed when the docks are constructed?—Yes.

759. Having regard to the future, what provision do you think ought to be made for enabling that traffic to get to Melbourne?—That is a question outside the railway point of view.

760. We want your suggestions independently?—Altogether, apart from the question of whose business it is to provide the means?—That is what I mean?—And, without saying that the Railway department are responsible for providing the means, I think that sufficient accommodation would be had by widening Flinders-street, and making a road from Flinders-street to La Trobe-street.

761. First of all by widening Flinders-street?—Ninety-five feet or more, to the full width of the street, and widening Flinders-street to the north alignment of that street, the bridge going over La Trobe-street, and improving Dudley-street bridge—that is all I consider necessary.

762. And for the future?—And for the future.
765. In addition to that, would it be necessary to connect Flinders-street so widened with La Trobe-street?—No, I do not see any necessity.

766. You do not contemplate any connexion between Flinders-street, after it is widened, and La Trobe-street, assuming the bridge to be built?—Except through the Harbour Trust ground.

767. Do you?—Yes.

768. Do you propose then to open up the street from Flinders-street through the railway-ground on to La Trobe-street?—No.

769. Supposing the case of someone starting at Goldsbrough's, and wanting to get to the head of the dock, how is he to get there?—By La Trobe-street.

770. Assuming the bridge to be built?—Yes.

771. Assuming no bridge to be built?—Round Flinders-street, round the gas works and Dudley-street.

772. That is the assumption that is provided at present?—Yes, and all that I think would be necessary at present.

773. But for the future?—The La Trobe-street bridge; and, if necessary, there is no difficulty, it is only a question of cost, of extending Bourke-street.

774. Why should not a street be run from Flinders-street to La Trobe-street, and so run along the head of the Harbour Trust land?—There is no objection; but the fact that the intimate connexion with the railway and the docks will cause lines to be run down to the docks as shown on the plan; then you would have level crossings on all those rails, and they are shunting continually.

775. If I want to go from Flinders-street to the north-east corner of the Harbour Trust dock site, I must cross those rails?—Yes, right up here—[pointing to the plan]—but not in the middle of our shunting traffic—I mean to say on the railway ground.

776. I understand that a street cannot be provided from Flinders-street to Lonsdale-street on the railway land, because it is higher than the Harbour Trust land?—Yes.

777. But the Harbour Trust can provide a street running along the east end of their docks on its own level?—Yes.

778. Will it not be necessary for protection that the Harbour Trust level be raised to the railway level?—No, we are adopting the lowest of our levels. We are running up here—[pointing to the plan]; there is a gradient of 1 in 40.

779. Will not the whole of the land lying between the dock, when finished, and your boundary be practically a street?—Yes, except what the Harbour Trust chooses to devote to warehouses and sheds.

780. As a fact, will it not be necessary for the Harbour Trust themselves to construct a road straight across the head of their docks?—Yes, certainly, or they could not get down.

781. Still, the question remains as to the mode of access to the road to be constructed; is it down Flinders-street to the bottom of the gas works?—That is a different question; we say if we divert the traffic on the Harbour Trust ground, the Harbour Trust ground being on a level, say 10 feet above low water mark, that they can best dispose of the traffic after that.

782. Already there is a plan practically agreed to between the Harbour Trust and the Railway as to a portion of the ground?—Yes, prepared by Mr. Brady.

783. And it has been considered on both sides that adequate access has been arranged for?—Yes.

784. Will you tell me for what purpose that land lying to the north of Dudley-street has been reserved by the railway?—I do not know. It was done before I was engineer of existing lines.

785. Who can tell us?—I do not know whether any one in the department can say. It was reserved in Mr. Highintosh's time; I was not engineer of this district. No, you mean this—[pointing to the plan]; that is since my time; if you thought you meant this other strip—[pointing to the plan]—the strip of land lying to the north of Dudley-avenue was reserved before I recollect. I was not connected with this district at all the time, but lately, since the Railway Commissioners came into office. It was at my motion that B was reserved.

786. What means of access have the people in Melbourne got to this yellow piece of land, assuming it is to be converted to commercial purposes?—They can get down Dudley-street or cross B as they could any unoccupied land, or at North Melbourne station.

787. Have you any plan showing which part of B the public are to cross?—Yes, I think we have the extension of North Melbourne; it is only the extension of the bridge at North Melbourne; the line can be carried down to West Melbourne, we have not any intermediate one.

788. Have you any plan showing any street over any part of B?—Yes, at North Melbourne.

789. Does it strike this road—[pointing to the plan]?—No, the line is marked at present it can go into West Melbourne swamp—[explaining on the plan]. It was proposed that if this canal were opened we could bring the coal barges up to block B.

790. There is a plan in existence showing that extension there—[pointing to the plan]?—Yes.

791. From the North Melbourne station down to where?—Across B to the West Melbourne swamp.

792. Is there any other access proposed to be given to the people in Melbourne to the part coloured yellow?—None that I know of.

793. What about Dudley-street?—Of course there is Dudley-street, but that is not what you mean; you mean through block B.

794. Say, I am residing in Melbourne, I will go down Dudley-street if you please—I want to get to the yellow part, if I come down Dudley-street I cannot cross B?—You can cross B, but not across the canal.

795. And down here I have the same difficulty with the canal—[pointing to the plan]?—Yes.

796. Then the only access to the part marked yellow must be either by water from Melbourne, or round by the North Melbourne station?—Practically it would be, or by draw-bridges across those canals.

797. If you had bridges across, they must be connected with streets; can you mark on B where you can have the streets?—Yes, certainly, from there to there—[pointing to the plan].

798. Have you a prize a plan showing it can be done?—Yes.

799. And binding yourself to do it?—That is a different thing altogether.

* See footnote, page 27.
800. As an extension of Flinders-street is intended to be made, instead of coming round up the road between the gas-works and the railway, would it not be better to bring Flinders-street in a curve up there—[pointing to the plan]?—It would certainly be a loss of railway land, but it would be possible.

801. Would it not be a saving of carriages?—Yes, we could improve it certainly, but it would be a sacrifice of some railway land which will eventually be valuable. The firewood traffic will be sent to North Melbourne, and the goods traffic for that will be devoted to goods sheds.

802. You spoke of the coal coming up the canal, do you mean the steamers or the barges?—The steamers themselves.

803. Then you will want a swing-bridge?—Yes.

804. If you merely meant the barges, fixed bridges would do?—It is only contemplated where it is possible to do that, but it was not made for that purpose. Coal steamers or barges might be brought up to deliver coal into our railway tracks. This is our railway gear that we are putting up now—[pointing to the plan].

805. Do I understand that the goods traffic could not be accommodated elsewhere than the lower level of O'Connell-street?—I do not say "could not," but that is by far the best place for it.

806. Where else could it be accommodated?—It should be put up in a similar position further north.

807. That would not be an insuperable objection, the more removing of the goods sheds further north?—It would be a question of cost, and a question, as the Mayor says, of cutting the southern part of Collins-street. You would then have the objection of bringing the passengers and goods traffic in the same street, as I have before pointed out.

808. How would it affect the connexion with Flinders-street?—It would not affect it.

809. Would it not be possible to move to and fro from the docks?—Yes.

810. Then carrying goods to and from will not arise. If I understand you, you can carry goods to and fro from everywhere. Take goods to the dock, and from there to any place—say Sandhurst?—Yes, to any where.

811. Have you any recollection or knowledge of the Premier, or the then Commissioner of Railways, Mr. Gillies, promising that Collins-street would be extended through?—No, I have not. My only recollection of any Minister's decision in the matter was that Mr. Bent said he would object to the extension of Flinders-street, and the members of the Harbour Trust were asked to meet us, and we pointed out the line of Flinders-street to them and they seemed to be satisfied.

812. Coming back to Collins-street, your heavy goods traffic would be still subjected to the 1 in 20 grade?—Yes.

813. By the plan proposed here?—Yes.

814. There is no getting over that?—No—[the witness further explained on the plan].

815. This, from A to the lower point here—[pointing to the plan]—was a gradient of 1 in 20. Mr. Lunt said?—Yes, but that is going over in case we obtained the line north of Collins-street.

817. Collins-street would be a descending grade from that point down to this point—[pointing to the plan]?—You could not do that, because you would render this frontage useless. All your gradients must be confined between those two points, otherwise you will have the street above the level of the goods sheds. Mr. Lunt was speaking of an overhead bridge: we are speaking of something different, that if we give up this you would have a gradient coming out from the goods sheds into Spencer-street, if not 1 in 20, at any rate very heavy.

818. There is 31 feet to 10 feet formation; that is 21 feet fall?—Yes.

819. And if there was a grade made from Spencer-street to the 15 chains?—You must go from this to this—[pointing to the plan]. It would be an uphill grade.

820. It would be less than one in twenty?—Yes, I daresay it would.

821. The grade from Collins-street to Flinders-street now is about one in thirty?—Yes.

822. That is 23 feet in 11 chains?—It will be about the same as that.

823. This is a greater distance—[pointing to the plan]?—No.

824. Assuming it is the same distance from Collins-street to Spencer-street on a grade leading down to this point—[pointing to the plan]?—It would be the same level, practically, as Spencer-street.

824A. Assuming that that is done, Collins-street extended, and the land north of Collins-street given up by the Railway department for extension of the city, would the heavy traffic, in your opinion, go up Collins-street then, considering the grade you have just referred to, or still adhere to Flinders-street on the level, seeing that the two streets are not far apart?—I think Flinders-street would, probably, be the main artery of the goods traffic.

825. You think the grade necessary in Collins-street, in that case, would have the effect of preventing the heavy traffic going in that direction, Flinders-street being on the level?—The Collins-street hill is an objection, and so is Bourke-street, to get away east. I think that traffic will still continue where it is in Flinders-street.

825A. One in forty is not a bad gradient?—Collins-street is more than that. I think you people would take Flinders-street, because it is practically level as far as Swanston-street, whereas you meet stiff hills in the other streets.

826. Is Flinders-street wide enough to take the traffic?—We propose to widen it.

826A. When widened it is only a chain and a half?—No, it is more than that—three chains and a half.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to-morrow at two o'clock.

* A* refers to present station site.
FRIDAY, 1st APRIL, 1887.

Present:

The Hon. R. Burrows, M.L.A.,
W. Madden, M.L.A.,
W. Anderson, Esq., M.L.A.,
J. Laurens, Esq., M.L.A.,

J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.L.A.,
P. Wright, Esq., M.L.A.,
W. Cain, Esq.,
C. Hodgkinson, Esq.

William Henry Greene, Esq., M. Inst. C.E., Railways Commissioner, further examined.

827. By the Commission.—Do you produce the plan which you were asked for yesterday, in a question asked in regard to the extension of certain streets?—Yes.
828. You said that plan had been compiled by you some time ago—in the hands of the draughtsman in the office.
829. Has that plan any mark or distinguishing number upon it?—It is marked plan B.
830. When was that plan compiled?—On 4th March, 1882.
831. By whom?—By my assistant in the draughtsman in the office.
832. What does that plan show?—It shows what would be involved in extending Collins-street to the Harbour Trust ground, crossing over the goods sheds at the lower level, and at the present level of Collins-street and its intersection with Spencer-street.
833. How much land does the railway department give up, according to that plan—about what area?—I cannot say, that was not calculated.
834. Approximately, it would be twenty acres?—It would be more than that, it would be forty acres no doubt.
835. Does it involve pushing the station away?—Further west.
836. How much further west?—The passenger station would be about ten or eleven chains further west of Spencer-street than it is at present.
837. That is nearer to the gas-works?—Nearer to the gas-works, but it would give too little room for our requirements; it only shows at most what could be done if it were necessary to extend Collins-street, and what it would have us.
838. Does that plan show clearly the extension of certain streets with a view only of the extension of the city, or does it show the extension of streets with a view of obtaining access to the docks?—It shows the extension of Collins-street with a view of obtaining access to the docks, and of no other street but Collins-street, and the extending of Bourke, Lonsdale, La Trobe, and little Bourke streets, as far as a street which might be made parallel to the railway, close to, in fact, where our present passenger station is now.
839. That is a street that, as far as the railway is concerned now, would take the place of Spencer-street?—Exactly.
840. The only street shown extended, to give better access to the docks, is Collins-street?—Yes.
841. Is the proposed extension and widening of Flinders-street shown upon that plan?—Yes.
842. Is the widening to the same amount upon that plan as it is proposed to be lately?—No, it is not; it shows allotments south of the continuation of Flinders-street, between the Wharf-road and the continuation of Flinders-street.
843. Was that plan ever adopted by the Railway department?—No, it was not.
844. Then, how does it appear at all?—It was only prepared by me to show what would be the result of extending Collins-street at that level—how it would affect the Railway department.
845. Was that plan prepared with a view to show that it was a feasible proposition to make that extension?—No. In this sense it was feasible, as a matter of engineering the levels admitted of it, but it was not a feasible proposition as far as the convenience of the Railway department was concerned. In fact, the plan showed that it would be inconvenient to the Railway department to do it.
846. Did that plan ever come before any Minister of Railways?—I do not think so. Possibly Mr. Bent may have seen it.
847. Was it compiled under the instructions of any Minister of Railways?—No. It was compiled at the time when the question of extending Flinders-street and Collins-street was raised in 1882. I got that prepared as one view of how it could be done, but it has not been by any means adopted by the Railway department, or approved by any responsible officer of the department.
848. Nor by yourself?—Nor by myself.
849. Then it was not at the suggestion of the City Council or of the Minister of Railways for the time being that that plan was made?—No, it was not.
850. That plan shows land cut up into streets that it is not now intended to utilize if this scheme of extending Bourke and Collins streets is carried out. It is not asked by anyone, certainly not the City Council, that this land should be taken from the Railway department; that is, this land west of Spencer-street?—No, it is not asked that that shall be done. That must be retained in any case, and more bought.
851. Does this extension of Collins-street contemplate the viaduct?—Yes, but crossing upon the level, which is a fatal objection to the plan, as I pointed out last night.
852. In that connection between Spencer-street and Flinders-street stations the line would run on the level, would that be a level crossing?—If it were supposed to be a level crossing?—If Collins-street were extended upon its present level it would necessitate a level crossing with the connecting viaduct.
853. Does that mean that in the main street of the town we are to have a level crossing over the line connecting the two stations?—If this plan were carried out it would involve that.
854. Would you recommend a level crossing in a main street?—Certainly not.
855. Then, if you would not recommend a level crossing in the principal street of the town, how would you propose the traffic to go?—Underneath. I mean that if the proposal of the City Council, as I understand it—that is, that the Railway department shall give up all the land south of Collins-street—be carried out, it would be necessary then to go under the viaduct, because the viaduct would go from Collins-street round to Flinders-street; and in order to get to the gas-works it would be necessary to go underneath that viaduct.
866. Under or over I presume?—Under or over, but under is the most feasible; and I wish to say, in connection with one of the last questions I was asked last night, what would be the gradient from Spencer-street to the gas-works, provided the Railway department gave up all the land south of Collins-street it was calculated here, hurriedly, at 1 in 40, but I omitted then to notice, that it must go under that viaduct, and that viaduct is fixed and it would make it 1 in 18.

867. Would you prefer a viaduct?—The proposed viaduct to connect Spencer-street with Flinders-street.

868. But if that proposed viaduct be not erected, or were moved to the west, the grade would be altered accordingly, and made easier?—Yes, but I will show how that is not practicable. If you did that you would take away the viaduct from the passenger station to the goods yard, and taking it to the goods yard you move it west.

869. If there are fourteen chains and a half from Spencer-street to the edge of the high ground, which was measured from that plan, the new station could be erected at fourteen chains and a half from Spencer-street?—Then there would not be room between that and the gas-works, or that and the Harbour Trust grounds for passengers and goods.

870. But if the passengers are landed at the fourteen chains and a half—the extreme edge—and the passenger station is fourteen chains and a half from Spencer-street, the viaduct, outside of that, and that arch would be on a grade from Spencer-street to the viaduct, outside of the fourteen and a half chains?—No, because it is not fourteen chains and a half; it is ten chains from the site fixed by the Act of Parliament.

871. What is the amount of deviation allowed?—There is a deviation, I think, of five feet or more.

872. You are assuming that there is an Act. I was not aware that there was an Act of Parliament fixing the site?—There is, and there is no deviation possible without a new Act.

873. Could not you move the station west?—Then you alter the relation of the viaduct.

874. It has been shown that in Collins-street a grade of 1 in 18 will be required if it be taken under or through the station?—No, if it is taken through upon the level it involves a level crossing and gates, which is impracticable.

875. The difference of level between the foot of Collins-street and the Harbour Trust land is what?—One in 40.

876. But you have omitted to take into account the fact that you have to go under the viaduct?—Decidedly.

877. So that makes it 1 in 18?—Yes.

878. I want to ask you further, will that same state of things apply to Bourke-street. We were told yesterday that it would be 1 in 20 for an under or an over bridge?—Certainly, that is the case, because the viaduct must be continued, even if you move up to La Trobe-street you must go on with the viaduct to Flinders-street, and therefore you must go under the viaduct, and you must cut the gradient to suit the levels.

879. So that it is not possible to extend Collins-street or Bourke-street or Lonsdale-street except with a grade of 1 in 20 or less?—It is not.

880. Following that question—do you think that with a street of 1 in 20 grade the traffic would go into those streets, or go round upon the level in Flinders-street?—I have no doubt it would go on at the level, and I instances it from every day experience. If you take a cab from Spencer-street to Flinders-street the man will drive you up Collins-street, and instead of going up the hill between King-street and William-street he will turn down King-street to get upon the level. Now, if that is the case with a light traffic, will it not be more so with heavy traffic?—They will go along the wharf the whole way.

881. Would not that bring a lot of the heavy traffic that now goes down Flinders-street, and bring it up Collins-street?—Up as far as King-street, and they would go down King-street.

882. Do you think it is desirable that the principal street of the town should have a heavy traffic, such as logs?—Decidedly not. You would destroy the distinctive character of the traffic of Collins-street, which may say is the Oxford-street or Regent-street of the town. Just imagine the coal traffic, the wood traffic, and timber traffic from the sheds going down Collins-street; it would destroy the street.

883. Is this the effect of your evidence, that, supposing the railway was not there at all, the gradient would be 1 in 20, or under?—No; there is a viaduct there; you must go down under that.

884. Assuming the railway was not there, I suppose there is nothing impracticable in connecting Collins-street with the dock?—There is the viaduct.

885. Assuming there is nothing in the way?—Then I say it is 1 in 40; but that viaduct comes in the way, and we must go under it or over it.

886. If this viaduct is erected, is it necessary that it shall be erected on this very line, as shown here?—By the Act it is.

887. How far does that Act of Parliament apply to this viaduct?—This was laid down here before that Act of Parliament, and the viaduct comes in even closer to Collins-street than that, that makes the gradients still worse.

888. Does the Act of Parliament definitely say that this viaduct (which is not a viaduct when it gets upon the railway land, it is upon table land) must take a particular line inside the railway lands?—I am not sure. I know what you mean, and that is whether the line is scheduled from the boundary of our railway reserve on our curtails, or whether it is scheduled to meet a certain point upon our reserve. I do not know which it is.

889. You said a grade of 1 in 18 to that particular point?—No; I say where the viaduct is fixed. It fixes the starting point in this way: if it describes a curve, that fixes a certain course, and you cannot get out of that.

890. Do you say that it cannot be altered, if necessary?—An Act of Parliament will be able to alter it, undoubtedly.

891. You say there is a certain amount of lateral deviation allowed; is any amount of vertical deviation allowed?—No level is fixed.

892. You can get as high or as low as you like?—So you can, but you must start from the level of the proposed viaduct; you are bound by that. [The witness explained this to me by an illustration.]

893. Then, are we to understand that if, for the sake of argument, it was decided that the station should go north of Bourke-street, it would necessitate a far larger viaduct, and, consequently, be far more expensive?—Yes; that is true. That is another feature.
That would follow, as a matter of course?—Yes; because you would have to carry the streets.

But it is not only an Act of Parliament to authorize a certain deviation, which might not be more costly in its character, but, as in this case, it may involve a larger expenditure?—We have not thought of the question of expenditure; but, no doubt, it would; because what is now made upon solid ground would have to be made upon a viaduct.

And be much longer, too?—Yes.

The point of departure, in any case, I suppose, must be in practice where your passengers land—the passenger platform?—Yes.

Free of country traffic?—Yes, very nearly so. You can go on the present level, and a little beyond that—I think a chain—and then you come upon the viaduct.

But, if any alteration is to be made from the present plan, by taking over any land from the railway, it would require an Act of Parliament in any case?—Certainly.

If the question of the viaduct is fixed, could not the alteration of the viaduct be embodied also in that Act?—Certainly.

But would it not also involve the raising of the whole of the passenger yards to get headway for the road by Collins-street or Bourke-street?—Yes, or else you must lower the street to get under, and that makes it impracticable.

If there is fourteen chains and a half, which you fixed last night, from Spencer-street to the line of the viaduct, it gives a grade of 1 in 40?—Pardon me, I did not fix that.

Fourteen chains and a half?—That was the distance between the level of Collins-street at its intersection with Flinders-street and the 10-feet level.

That was 22 feet of grade?—One in 40 I knew it was calculated at last night, but that was assuming that there was no such thing as the viaduct there, but I find there is one, of course. On looking at the plan last night, immediately after I left the room, I said, "We cannot have a continuous gradient from the intersection of Collins-street at a continuous level." You must go down.

But, in asking that question, I had it in my mind that it would be necessary to have that distance to get that level?—So it is necessary, but we find we have not got fourteen chains and a half; we are pulled up at five or six chains.

But if you move the viaduct?—Of course that would be practicable.

But you say it is impracticable, because you would not go from the passenger yard and would go through the goods yard?—Certainly.

It was not contemplated at that time to give up the ground?—No, not to abandon any railway reserves south of Bourke or Collins streets at all, but the object was to bring a straight line of railway to the present shed, called the Exhibition grain shed. It is in the straight line of North Melbourne, and it was proposed, I think by the mayor, Mr. Coller. I find, from reference to the schedule to the Act, that there is a starting point fixed.

What is the limit of deviation?—(Mr. Steventon) Fifteen feet.

The witness withdrew.

The Hon. Thomas Loader, J.P., examined.

By the Commission.—You are a member of the Melbourne Harbour Trust?—I am.

And were Chairman during one year?—Yes.

You have had a long experience of the requirements of the city in regard to railway arrangements?—Yes, I have.

I understand that at one time you made a proposal for the extension of the city westwards?—Yes.

You were among the first who made it?—Yes; for the last twenty-five or thirty years I have been in favour of it. I have been of opinion that Collins-street ought never to have been stopped where it is now; it ought to have been carried through.

Do you mean Collins-street only?—I think the same with regard to all the streets abutting upon Spencer-street.

You formed that opinion twenty-five years ago?—Yes, when I had the honor to represent this portion of the city in Parliament.

Have you held that opinion all through?—Most completely.

Have you followed the evidence given before this Commission upon the matter?—I have.

And the evidence given by Mr. Speight and Mr. Greene?—Certainly. I have had many conversations with them upon the subject.

Do you think it is possible to extend those streets, and give the same facilities to the public as they have at present?—Yes, I do. It is entirely a question of cost.

Have not you heard that the Railway Commissioners say that it would place the railway passenger station further away, and give less facilities both to passengers and goods?—Yes, I have heard that said by them.

Are you still of opinion that the station might be moved?—I wish it to be understood that I am of opinion that the streets ought to be carried over the stations.

Then, in your proposal, you do not contemplate parting with any land at all?—I think that that is a question that has arisen more recently. The parting with a portion of the land south of Collins-street is an idea that has arisen in consequence of the Railway Commissioners also recently stating that they cannot permit those streets to be carried through the railway reserve. Of course, the public immediately say, "If you will not give us access across the land you have reserved we must cut your land short—we must take some away from you, because access we must have." Therefore, I consider that the new question of taking away a portion of the railway reserve from the Railway Commissioners has arisen entirely from their positive determination not to allow those streets to be carried over the railway if they can prevent it.

Did you agree to the resolution of the Harbour Trust, that the extension of Collins-street and Flinders-street was sufficient?—No; no such resolution was ever carried.

Melbourne Extension.
915. I understood that Mr. Hodgkinson was authorized to state here that those were the views of the Harbour Trust — Not that they were sufficient. There is no finality in that resolution. There was a minimum named.

916. No viaduct at all was projected when you first formed this opinion as to the extension of the streets? — I do not think there was.

917. That has really been passed in the last two or three years? — Certainly.

918. Does not that alter your opinion? — Not in the least, I view the question from a citizen’s point of view entirely, and have always held that it is not right for the railway to monopolize the whole west end of the city—that it should make the west end of Melbourne a cul-de-sac. On the other hand, I consider that access should be made across the railway reserve to the territory lying west of the railway reserve; and I am certain that that can be done without interfering with the public convenience as far as the railway station is concerned.

919. You have heard that, if the viaduct is constructed where Parliament has authorized it to be made, to extend Collins-street would involve its having a grade of 1 in 187? — Yes, I hear so.

920. Do you think goods would ever be brought in to the city over that gradient? — I do not think so, but I apprehend that that gradient could be very much modified; in fact, I believe that if other engineering views were sought outside the Railway department this difficulty would be overcome. But it seems to me, with the highest respect for the railway officials, with many of whom I have the honour of personal friendship, that they have made themselves into a concert of mass of opinion— that they have it this way and no other way, and they entirely ignore the great mass of citizens in the matter. It seems impossible that the traffic across into the western district of the city—which is now rising up—should be permitted to be impeded by the railway reserve; it seems to me so utterly unreasonable that I should most decidedly like to see some decision arrived at to open the opening of the communication without injuring the railway in the least.

921. Of course, as you said before, you have always argued that the streets should be carried over the railway lines? — Yes; and I think so still. Will the Commission permit me to draw attention to one simple fact? Practically, this railway site where we are now situated is in a very central position, so far as Melbourne and its suburbs are concerned, because if you take the suburbs of Footscray, and Williamstown, and Kensington, and all round, you will find, if you look at the map, that it bears to those suburbs—the western suburbs—a very central position, when regarded in relation to the eastern suburbs as a whole, when this West Melbourne swamp, and Coole Island, and the land down to Sandridge is all occupied, which it will be, of course, in a period of time, it will be found that Spencer-street station is very much more central than appeared to be the case, when, twenty-five years ago, it was first used. The effect of the railway obtaining this large reserve, which is marked B upon the plan, very much diminishes the value of that West Melbourne swamp, as a whole, for the purposes of city extension, unless some means of access are provided through that territory marked B to get to the yellow territory which lies beyond there, and if the Commissioners visit the land they will see for themselves, very rapidly, indeed, what I am now describing to them—I have been down with the Harbour Trust Commissioners to inspect it, but, unless some means of access therefrom to the yellow territory is made, the value of that as city extension property would be very much diminished. These means of access can only be provided by extending those streets that abut upon the railway, and carrying them on, and leaving also provision to go through the lands reserved now by the railway, marked B; but the extension of Collins-street will be necessary for a wholly different purpose, if it be extended and cut off, when it strikes the Melbourne gas-works, taken off to the right, and run along the edge of the docks, it will provide accommodation for the whole of the passenger and light traffic from the docks. I do not think that the Commission should consider that the heavy traffic will ever come up Collins-street; I do not believe it ever will. The heavy traffic will always keep down on the lower road on Flinders-street; but there is an immense quantity every day of light wheeled traffic and passengers, which will run up and down Collins-street, and if Collins-street be extended down, it will be found, I think, in the future of the port, that the intercolonial steamers, instead of coming up the river to the wharf, will go straight into the dock, and deliver in a line with Collins-street extension—for if Collins-street be extended in the way I suggest now, it will run right by the docks—and the intercolonial steamers will come up and lay themselves alongside the docks and discharge their passengers.

922. Your trust has recently adopted a very small portion of a dock scheme? — Yes.

923. Not showing one-twentieth of the acreage, I presume, that the docks will when finished? — No.

924. Would it be possible to state approximately, from your large experience as a commercial man, and knowing the growth of the city, would you venture to say how many years must elapse before the entire dock scheme must be carried out? — Seeing the very rapid pace at which the public improvements move in this colony, after they have once received Parliamentary authority, I should not be surprised to see the dock continuously proceeded with until it is completed, within the next six years, perhaps.

925. The whole of the dock scheme? — I think it is very likely it will be all completed.

926. Have you any idea what the total expense of constructing these docks is? — I do not remember from memory.

927. Under a million? — Yes, £600,000 I think it is.

928. £800,000 in round numbers? — Perhaps so.

929. Do not you think that for the present, and for several years, at any rate, to come, the widening of Flinders-street will give a sufficient access to those docks? — I do not think so for one moment. I am quite emphatic upon that point, and I am, more than that, greatly surprised to hear the engineers say it will be. It seems to me they are simply desirous of getting rid of the difficulty of crossing Collins-street.

930. What do you think of the proposal to extend La Trobe-street? — That is, of course, the easiest way, viewing it from a personal observation; I knew that the levels are more favourable there, and I think that should be extended.

931. You heard that the cost of extending Collins-street would be about £160,000? — Yes.

932. Speaking from the citizens’ point of view, as you say you have been all through, do you think the municipal authorities of the city, the corporation, should be called upon to pay any part of the cost of that extension? — I think that is rather a question for the legislature to deal with, than for me.
933. In your opinion, would it not be sufficient for this Commission to recommend that no obstacle should be placed against the future extension of Collins-street whenever that should be required, waiting until the requirement should be clearly and distinctly shown?—I think that would be a great guide, but the reason why at present the Harbour Trust cannot get Flinders-street extended is, that we do not know who is to pay the cost. The city say, "We are quite willing that Flinders-street should be extended through, but the Harbour Trust must build a retaining wall, and widen the street," and the Harbour Trust say "We have no power to spend money outside our own territory," so I imagine it is a question the legislature must deal with as to the providing the money.

934. Even in smaller matters that the extension of Flinders-street, is not there a continual argument going on between the Trust and other bodies as to the proportionate amounts to be spent in such works; for instance, the acquiring of a small allotment upon the banks of the Yarra?—We always get the worst of it; we are always as liberal as we can be in anything like that.

935. Do you think it is impossible to get a better gradient than the officers of the Railway department have stated for the extension of Collins-street over the railways, namely, 1 in 20—would you still consider it was in fact the interests of the public to spend £169,000 in extending Collins-street over the railways, if I mention that 1 in 20 is as steep as Collins-street east of Swanston-street?—Opposite the Argus office?

936. Yes?—I would rather take the street at that grade than be without it.

937. You think light traffic would still go there?—I do. I would rather take the street a great deal with that gradient.

938. You do not think that the extension of La Trobe-street, with a very much better gradient, and extending straight to the docks, and meeting the dock road in a very important point, would be more useful to that road than Collins-street?—No, it would be very useful, but not so good.

939. Costing £40,000 less?—I do not think much of £40,000 in improving a city like this.

940. You expect, I presume, that when the docks are constructed, a considerable amount of goods will be landed there?—Yes.

941. Would not also a considerable amount of those goods be conveyed to the country by rail?

942. What would be the way of making communication between the docks and the railway?—The railway would put in a siding to the head of the docks.

943. That being so, would your communication from Collins-street not lead to a series of level crossings over those railways?—Yes, but these railways would always have any trains running over them at a high speed, only goods wagons pushed along by hand power or horse power at the most.

944. Would not the extension of La Trobe-street in a great measure avoid those level crossings?—I do not think there would be any level crossings between the railway and the docks. The lines I refer to are only those lines that would be service lines for the docks, just as you now see them on the Hobson's Bay jetty and Williamstown line jetties.

945. Still, they have to be crossed, no matter what you call them?—No doubt, they have to be crossed.

946. But would not they have also to be crossed if you diverted right or left?—Yes, you must cross; you cannot possibly avoid it. In any docks in the world, where the rails run on a level way by the side of the ship, you always find that any horse traffic is across them.

947. You know it thoroughly, as a resident in Melbourne, as well as connected with the wharves, and so on; is it your opinion that Flinders-street, however widened, would not be sufficient for the traffic that would find its way from those docks, once they are constructed?—Yes, I think it would be insufficient.

949. If Flinders-street be widened, by cutting off the railway, so as to correspond with the northern part of Flinders-street, and Flinders-street be assumed opposite that point to be of the full width from such northern line descends wharves, are there any docks in the United Kingdom that would have such a fine access to them as those?—I do not know all the docks in the United Kingdom, but the approaches to the Liverpool docks are much wider than this would be, and the Hull docks too. Birkenhead docks have very fine approaches. This is an approach road, but it is a long distance off. What I complain of would be having to go all round the side of the river, and the side of the gas-works to get there; that is right enough for heavy traffic, as I before mentioned, but for light traffic, passenger traffic, and so forth, Collins-street would be much more direct and convenient in every way, and much more used. Another thing I have heard said frequently, that is that it is not desirable that passenger traffic and goods traffic should be crushed into the same street, but this proposal to widen Flinders-street for both means that they are both to be rushed there; but I propose to put the heavy traffic into Flinders-street, and the light traffic into Collins-street.

950. Are you acquainted with the Liverpool docks?—I am; I lived there a long time ago.

951. Are you aware that there is a line of railway approaching the docks?—I am.

952. And that it is crossed each end of the street by the traffic?—I am.

953. Are you aware that for the whole length of the docks the streets abut upon the docks?—I am.

954. And cross the railway to go to the docks?—They do, every one of them.

955. You said just now that a large portion of the imports to the port would be taken up the country direct from the docks; now, what class of imports are those, and to what proportion do you think, without being distributed in the city of Melbourne?—The proportion is very much smaller than is popularly supposed. The inward cargoes are generally required, first of all, to be taken into a shed, and a Custom House officer comes and deals with the dutiable goods; then they are taken to the wholesale warehouses in the city, and then they are distributed and sent back again to the railway before they are transmitted up the country. The country, therefore, is only those that are consigned to up-country firms direct, or, in very few cases, such things as wire and galvanized iron, and other heavy and bulky articles.

956. And machinery?—And machinery, where cartage is saved; but it is rather a popular fallacy, of well-informed men, too, as a rule, to suppose that the inward cargoes go in any large quantities up the country, without being first brought into the city to be dealt with; but these remarks do not apply to the export trade in grain and wool, and so forth.
957. It would not be wrong to suppose that not more than 10 per cent. of the imports go direct into the country?—I think it would be a fair quantity; I have heard this question discussed before.

958. What proportion of the direct trade from the country is shipped at once into the ships without being warehoused in Melbourne, that is, the export trade?—I should imagine, without having any data to form an opinion upon, that perhaps 80 per cent. goes.

959. Direct?—I should think so, 70 to 80 per cent.

960. I would suppose that a large portion of the wool is first warehoused in Melbourne, afterwards re-handled and sent to the shipping; you think 20 per cent. would cover that?—Perhaps I might be wrong there; I do not know, I have no means of forming an opinion; I know it must be a large quantity. I should like to modify that statement of 80 per cent., because really I have no means of knowing; but we all do see and know that a very large quantity of exports come direct to the ship, being sold from samples.

961. You see no difficulty in the question of the rail crossing the streets?—Not the slightest.

962. You have not had an opportunity of studying the question from an engineer's point of view at all?—I was brought up upon railway works, at the Saltley works in England, and we had a good deal to do with railways.

963. You speak principally of Collins-street?—Yes.

964. Do your remarks apply to Bourke and La Trobe and Lonsdale streets?—Yes.

965. Do you advocate the construction of a series of bridges over the railway lines at those points?—Yes, but not perhaps at once; some consideration should be given to the future.

966. Do you think the extension of Flinders-street and La Trobe-street would be sufficient accommodation for some years to come?—No, I think all the extension will be insufficient unless Collins-street is extended.

967. Did you read the report of the City Council asking that the whole of the streets from Flinders-street to Bourke-street be extended, and that La Trobe-street be extended over the railway; did you see that report?—I think I did.

968. Would you consider that the City Council, acting in the interests of the city and the public generally, would be doing their duty if they did not ask for, at least, those extensions?—I should most decidedly think they were not doing their duty if they did not ask for those extensions. I am a freeman of the city of London, and I cannot imagine the city of London permitting any railway to cut it in half, in the way that this railway cuts this city in half.

969. You seem to differ totally from the city proposition, which is to extend the streets and sell the land abutting upon those streets?—I do not go as far as selling the land.

970. I believe the city proposal is this: that Collins-street shall be extended and that all the land south of Collins-street shall be sold in the market for building purposes in the extension of the city. Do you agree with that?—I do not.

971. Mr. Stewart.—That is not the city proposition.

972. By the Commission.—In your scheme you do not advocate the sale of any land at present belonging to the Railway department?—I do not.

973. Mr. Stewart.—Neither does the city.

974. By the Commission.—You do not advocate any parting with the railway reserve?—No, all I propose is that the public shall have access over, and the Railway department have access under.

975. A question was put to Mr. Speight—it was this: would a portion of this marked blue (that is the Harbour Trust reserve), added to the railway reserve, be anything like an equivalent to taking the land south of Collins-street for the railways; would the Harbour Trust consent to that?—If the Harbour Trust were asked to cut off the eastern end, north of the gas-works, on the west boundary, in exchange for the land south of Collins-street, the Harbour Trust would be very glad to take it.

976. If that exchange were made, how would you manage with your docks?—We would shorten the docks.

977. Then you do not require all those docks?—We would leave that for a future question; we might get other land in another direction.

978. If the Harbour Trust were agreeable to give up a piece of land west of the railway, and north of the gas-works, and be compensated for that piece of land by receiving an equal area facing the river in the yellow land, west of the present land, would that be considered an equivalent?—I think, as far as acreage is concerned, it would be an engineering question as to how the dock accommodation could be arranged. But there is a piece of land south of Flinders-street, which the extension of Flinders-street will never from this railway property. I think that should be given to the Harbour Trust.

979. That is not shown upon any of the maps we have. It is marked blue as Harbour Trust land?—If the piece at the end of Dudley-street were included the Trust might consider the proposition, but I am utterly unable to say what they would do.

980. Do you mean the piece of land left after extending Flinders-street, and making it 100 feet wide?—Yes.

981. Are you aware that the proposition is to make Flinders-street, at that point, about 200 feet wide?—Yes.

982. Is this the piece of land you refer to—(pointing to a map)?—Yes.

983. That is not in the occupation of the railway at present?—Yes it is.

984. You understand that Flinders-street is to be carried out 96 feet wide?—Yes.

985. Then there would be a piece left to the south of it?—Yes.

986. Of course, you only speak for yourself?—Yes, entirely.

987. You would have to remodel the dock scheme entirely?—But, you must understand, I have not expressed an opinion, only a probability.

988. The reports of the officers of the Railway department show that the costs of the extension of those streets across the railway would be, in round numbers, £700,000. I presume, in providing those streets across, you suppose that the legislature would vote this money?—Of course, the whole of the £700,000 will
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not be wanted at once. If two or three of those streets were put through now, they might for several years, perhaps ten or fifteen years, or, perhaps, another street, before one generation had expired, and so on; and in that way I daresay that Parliament would provide the money.

985. At any rate Parliament would have to provide the money?—Yes; but it is necessary, in speaking of the matter, for me to mention, to remember that we shall not want it all at once. You may want only £150,000 or £200,000 at once to carry one or two of those streets through.

986. You just now said that Lonsdale and Flinders streets would not be sufficient?—No; I said we must have Collins-street.

987. Collins-street of itself would absorb a good deal more that your estimate?—Would it. I wish to be understood that I consider that Flinders and Collins streets and LaTrobe-street would for the present be sufficient; but Mr. Hodgkinson’s question was whether the others, if carried through, requiring so large a sum of money, should be done?

988. Supposing it was decided to carry through one of those, at present, which of them would you recommend?—Only one?

989. Only one; which one?—I consider we are already committed to Flinders-street.

990. Assuming that we had the river, which of course is a very important one, Flinders-street, Dudley-street, and North Melbourne bridge, which of the other streets would you recommend to be carried through?—Whether Collins-street, Lonsdale, or La Trobe streets?

991. Yes?—I say Collins-street. I have said so all along, and I say so now.

992. Do you consider the legislature should provide that?—I think that the railway ought to pay a portion of it.

993. You think the advantage of Collins-street in providing for the light traffic from the docks would more than compensate for the increased cost over La Trobe-street?—Yes; one costs £160,000 and the other £129,000. That is only £31,000 difference. That is very little.

994. On the one side you have increased cost and worse gradient; on the other side less cost and better gradients, still you think the advantage is on the side of Collins rather than La Trobe-street?—Yes; I think Collins-street ought to be extended, and the question of cost ought not to enter the minds of those concerned at all if the work must be done at some time. I think the intention of the Railway Commissioners to carry Collins-street through their passenger station, which you know they talk of doing, half does the work as it were. They will get through the passenger station to the wood level where the rails run for the wood and then the over-bridge there will carry the light traffic straight down into the swamp. The question of the viaducts for the railways is a question that the railway engineers must settle, because I take a citizen’s view of the matter; but I believe that engineers can be found who can adjust the gradients and levels to make them fit.

995. Is it not owing to the increase of light traffic from the wharves that we have been in communication with the trustees of the tramways to know whether they could not run omnibuses along the wharves?—Yes, it is; and of course the tramways would run their tramways down the extension of Collins-street to the docks immediately.

1000. You think the extension of Collins-street so important that the element of cost is of no importance at all?—Not the slightest.

1001. Not even if it cost £5,000,000?—That is another thing altogether, I mean within a reasonable sum.

1002. Then you think at a reasonable cost such as is mentioned, say £150,000, the thing ought to be done?—I do really.

1003. That entailing the alteration of all the lines and the complete disarrangement of the present railway yard, which would be another immense sum of money?—I do not see that it would require that. It would require the knocking down of that goods shed which never ought to have been put up.

1004. You do not agree then that that goods shed is in the right place?—Certainly not.

1005. The goods shed?—Yes, it is in the wrong place altogether. The passenger traffic any way will end here. They are going to have that end-on platform here, and all you then have to deal with is the goods traffic, and if they carry on the goods traffic at the lower levels, as they propose to do, there will be no difficulty in carrying the traffic over it. The difficulty will be in getting the connexion to the eastern railway station. If it is to be along a viaduct the engineering difficulty comes in; but the communication between the two systems is not very large, and it is generally conducted now in the night time or at some time when there is very little traffic.

1006. It will be of immense importance when the outer circle railway is constructed?—Yes. It would be much more important then. There should be a viaduct, I have no doubt.

1007. But if sufficient headway could be obtained that would solve the difficulty?—Of course it would.

1008. Have you sufficient knowledge of engineering works to say that a heading could be got under the viaduct?—No I have not; but I have heard a great many people who have knowledge say that it could be done.

1009. You said just now that you thought the railway should pay portion of the expense. Does not the State own the railways?—Yes.

1010. That would be the same thing?—Yes, it would be the same thing in one sense, by subdivision of account.

1011. It is a matter of account?—Nothing else.

1012. Suppose you had to decide between the extension of Collins-street and the viaduct, which would you throw overboard?—I do not think I have sufficient information before me to give an opinion.

1013. Do you think a viaduct of very great importance?—Undoubtedly. But I have not the very dreadful objection to level crossings that most people have. I think, under proper control and regulations, it is quite possible to have a level crossing at the entrance to a city or town, without any great amount of danger.

1014. Notwithstanding the instance we have just been obliged to do away with at Richmond?—Swan-street—yes.

1015. You know that the junction of the two stations has cost us thousands of pounds already now for accidents?—You know at Swan-street there was always a certain amount of traffic at a high speed, but
in crossing out of the station here at Collins-street there would be very little or no speed upon the trains at all. They would be just leaving the station. If the trains have to travel at a high speed I think a level creating very dangerous, but if they travel only at a low speed into or out of a station it could be managed.

1016. If lines are laid down across one another and one line is blocked where trains are passing upon the other?—Yes. No doubt that has to be considered.

1017. You explained that you thought Collins-street should be extended so the light traffic coming in steamers might be taken that way from the docks?—Yes.

1018. Does it not seem that if the steamers were put on this jetty at the foot of La Trobe-street, seeing that the levels of La Trobe are better than Collins-street, that it would be even better than Collins-street?—Yes, if the traffic went to the northward; but as the traffic goes mostly to the south, the tendency of all of it is to go to the centre street as quickly as possible.

1019. The extension of La Trobe-street would practically run on to your main jetty in the new dock, which would be a very important consideration.—I think, referring to the Chairman's question between the abandonment of the Collins-street system or of the viaduct, if the two are incompatible, and the adoption of one rendered the other impossible, I think the street would have to give way. But, in that case, I think Bourke-street would have to be substituted.

1020. Mr. Commissioner Greene says that the same difficulty in regard to the viaduct will apply to Bourke-street. In that case you would go to La Trobe-street?—I think then that that brings up another question. It makes me an advocate for moving the railway station to the north of Bourke-street. I wish it to be understood that if communication cannot be made across the railway, either at Collins-street or Bourke-street, then I think that the advocates who wish to remove the railway station to the north of those streets have every argument in their favour.

1021. Would the removal of the station to the north of Bourke-street do away with the viaduct; it would still be as great an obstruction?—So it would. But I think that is an engineering difficulty that the profession ought to surmount.

The witness withdrew.

William Meekel Fehon examined.

1022. By the Commission.—Are you one of the gentlemen who have taken a very great interest in the extension of the City of Melbourne westward from time to time?—Yes, I have given it a great deal of consideration.

1023. And have published some plans showing some street so suggested?—I did not publish the plans. The Argus published the plans in illustration of some letters of mine.

1024. From plans drawn by you?—Really, it was drawn by myself.

1025. Have you had any experience in railway matters?—Yes.

1026. Over how many years?—I had experience in England, in America, and fourteen years in this colony.

1027. Upon the Victorian railways?—Yes.

1028. In what office?—Various offices. I was traffic manager at the time I left the department.

1029. How long had you been traffic manager?—I do not exactly know how long, but as assistant traffic manager and traffic manager, I suppose six years.

1030. Was it during your period of office as assistant traffic manager or traffic manager that you formulated (these plans for the extension of the city?)—No.

1031. Was it after you left the department?—Yes, long after.

1032. Did it not strike you while you were in the department that the scheme could be carried out without detriment to the system?—I did not give it any consideration; in fact, there was no necessity for it. It is ten years since I left the department, and the growth of the city westward has been since that time.

1033. The growth of the city has not proceeded beyond Spencer-street?—I mean the increase of the value of property.

1034. Your proposition is that a certain area of land should be taken from the Railway department and sold, is it not?—Yes; in fact, I would take away the whole of the railway reserve to North Melbourne.

1035. Put the stations back to North Melbourne?—No.

1036. How would you manage for a station?—I provide one station on the extension of Collins-street, fronting on Spencer-street, and the extension of Collins-street, backing on to Flinders-street, and extending to the gas-works; the block of land between Flinders-street and the extension of Collins-street bounded by the gas-works.

1037. That is one station?—Yes.

1038. For what?—Passengers only. The viaduct continues at the back of that to Flinders-street, where I propose to use the whole of the land, at present used for passengers and goods, for a large suburban passenger terminus.

1039. In Flinders-street?—In Flinders-street. There is about ten acres of land in the present Flinders-street station altogether.

1040. You mean the present Hobson's Bay station?—Yes.

1041. Could that be extended to accommodate passengers and goods?—No, passengers only.

1042. And the new station in Spencer-street would be for passengers and goods?—No, passengers only.

1043. Where would the goods station be?—On the reserve immediately below the gas-works, at present marked as belonging to the Harbour Trust.

1044. Is that the portion marked blue?—Yes.

1045. The whole of the docks site?—The whole of the docks site.

1046. You would infringe upon the Harbour Trust jurisdiction at once?—Yes; but there is a better site for the Harbour Trust.

1047. Where; further back again?—No, not much further back; the piece of land called Coode's Island. I have had opportunities of noticing the character of the ground, and from the appearance of the
formation when they excavated the cut, it occurred to me that it is a very much better system for docks than the place immediately below the gas-works: and with the excavation from the dock I propose to fill in the old bed of the Yarra between the new cannon and the Saltwater river, making it no longer an island but a portion of the West Melbourne land, and cart-roads or lines of railway can run immediately from the docks to the goods railway station.

1045. In your scheme you certainly do not intend to give up any land between Collins and Flinders streets, but still retain that in the Railway department?—Yes.

1049. All that block?—Yes.

1050. Instead of having it, the station as at present, facing Spencer street, you would turn it round?—I would front it on the south side of Collins-street extension.

1051. What streets would you extend?—Collins-street and all the streets.

1053. You would have land available on one side of it?—Yes, and all extended without railways or viaducts.

1054. Would not all those new streets, if so projected, be intersected at almost ten or a dozen feet with the railway lines?—Not at all, the railway lines would all be swept away from North Melbourne, the viaduct would commence at North Melbourne and run down to the gas-works.

1054. The viaduct would be in your way in the extension of the streets?—No.

1055. As a matter of level?—No.

1056. What would you do then, would you raise it?—I believe, myself, simply from observation, I have not taken levels, in fact I am not an engineer or a surveyor, but I believe there is plenty of way for road traffic to pass under the viaduct, if it were constructed between North Melbourne and the gas-works.

1057. The levels show that to get under the viaduct, there would be a grade of 1 in 18?—[No answer.]

1058. The line of your viaduct is out beyond the gas-works, west of the gas-works?—No, east of the gas-works, it would skirt the gas-works very close.

1059. So that would allow sufficient grade from Spencer-street to that point for traffic, the slope of the streets I mean?—Yes.

1060. It is your impression that the viaduct should be at such a height that the streets would pass under it?—Yes.

1061. Did you hear Mr. Loudon's evidence?—Yes.

1062. You heard him say that he would not advocate the sale of any of those lands, but the streets should all go over the railway lines?—Yes.

1063. But yours is a contrary proposition exactly, that you would take the streets under the railway, and sell the lands?—Yes, they would eventually go under the railway, but that would be from half-a-mile to a mile back from the present Spencer-street.

1064. That would push the viaduct back?—Yes, a considerable distance into the swamp.

1065. Have you settled the levels of that viaduct?—I have settled them with my eye.

1066. But more precisely?—No.

1067. You have taken no levels and no borings in the swamp?—No, but I have heard a good deal about the borings.

1068. Have you seen the results of the borings taken by the Harbour Trust officers?—Yes.

1069. You would bring the passenger station between Collins-street and Flinders-street to be upon the level of the present passenger station?—Yes, at Spencer-street.

1070. According to the evidence given and the plans, that is some thirty odd feet above high water, allowing twenty feet of difference between the lower grade and the upper, is that so?—Yes. I know nothing of the levels, simply by observation, as I said before. I have been a railway man many years, and though not connected with the engineering branch, I have a pretty accurate eye in telling whether the viaduct could be built to allow the traffic under it, and I have come to the conclusion that it can.

1071. Would you earmark the area of the present station yard?—Do away with it altogether.

1072. I thought you said go back into the swamp?—No, I provide for a passenger station between Flinders-street and the Collins-street extension, and the goods station upon that blue reserve of the harbour Trust, that is the scheme I put forward.

1073. Then the stations would be further away than they are at the present time?—The goods station would be at a certain extent; but I make this allowance, that if the city is going to extend to the west, it will be more central than Spencer-street is at present, because Spencer-street is upon the border of the city.

1074. Do you know any case, in your experience as a railway man, where having a central railway station in a good position, action has been taken to put it further away from the recognised centre?—No, I do not know that I do.

1075. No doubt, as a railway man, you know a number of instances where very large sums of money have been spent to bring railways to the centre?—Yes, but you must bear in mind that that is in the older cities of the world where railways were never thought of when the cities were built, and the competition of the railway companies tends to bring traffic to the centre; it is the competition of railway companies that induces the great destruction of property that you see in the cities of Europe.

1076. Have you in your mind the fact that a large quantity of land has been sold with the understanding that the present railway station is to be the centre of railway communication, and that the purchasers might have a claim at law for compensation?—No, because I think Spencer-street would become more central.

1077. You say that competition between corporate companies to get near to the centres of population with their stations is to get traffic away from one another?—Yes, that is the object.

1078. After all, is it a question of public convenience?—Yes.

1079. Ought not it to rule a public department as well as a company?—Yes, but I know no city so well acquainted with the railways as Melbourne at the present time.

1080. Do you think the proposal to put the stations half-a-mile further away would be well received?—I do not propose that, except the goods station.
1081. How much land would your proposal set free to be put upon the market?—The whole of the land to the Saltwater River, about 700 acres.

1082. I speak of the land at present used by the Railway department.—The whole of the land marked pink upon the plan.

1083. That is about 150 acres.—[No answer.]

1084. Would not the portion of the swamp to be occupied by your proposed new station be much more costly than the present site, owing to the foundations being so bad in that swamp?—That is all according to the class of buildings put on. Take the gas-works for instance, there are some very permanent buildings there.

1085. Are you aware that where those permanent buildings exist, they found at a certain depth below the surface they were upon volcanic rock, and when they went beyond a certain point they found it went down perpendicularly, and they utterly failed to get foundations, and they had to give up putting up a gasometer; and that the site where you put your station is where they failed to put the gasometer?—I think there is a great difference between putting a good station up and a gasometer. For a gasometer they have to excavate to a great depth.

1086. I ask, would that not be more costly land to put foundations in?—No doubt the foundations would be more costly upon a bad foundation than upon a hard one.

1087. Have you had any experience in building?—No as the builder myself, but I have had very considerable experience in buildings.

1088. Do you think what is called sand concrete would answer for foundations in that locality; it is very much used in France?—I believe it would, and I will give you an illustration. I believe that large chimney connected with Blyth, Irving, and Binney's place upon the Saltwater River is built upon the surface, just a sod taken up and red gum planks laid there, and that tall chimney built upon the surface.

1089. I do not know whether it is correct, but I have been informed upon good authority that a considerable subsidence has taken place in those buildings?—I did not know that, but it has been up about 20 years.

1090. You remember when I and Captain Clarke were appointed a board to investigate a difference between Mr. Darbyshire, the engineer-in-chief, and a contractor. There was a bank built, and there was a considerable subsidence?—Yes, but then the swamp was all covered with water. I used to shoot ducks there, and it would be impossible to do that now.

1091. Are you aware that upon the line to Coburg an embankment went down to a very considerable extent?—I dare say it might, and it would be more costly if it did.

1092. Then the establishment of a railway station upon your site, owing to the ground not being so good as upon the old site, would be much more costly?—I admit it would be more costly, but the advantages are so very great that it would justify any reasonable cost.

1093. The moving of that railway yard and the goods station out to the western point you name would entail a very large expenditure; how would you propose to recoup the railway for that outlay, or to find funds for building a new station?—I consider that all the expenditure the railway is put to should be a first charge upon the sale of the West Melbourne lands.

1094. Have you any idea of what those lands would realise?—Of course, it is a matter of conjecture; but, judging by the past, my own idea is this, to recoup the Railway department any expense they might be put to for moving their work, and after that the low-lying lands should be gradually filled by the Harbour Trust and sold by the Government of the day as they become valuable as city property; and the money should be put by as a sinking fund to redeem our debentures as they become due, and I believe within the life of the next generation it would pay all the public debt of this colony, but to do that you must open all the streets right through. You must have no railways or viaducts at all. If any attention is paid to my scheme, it must be a radical change or drop it altogether. You cannot take it in part.

1095. If your scheme were carried out, the land south of the river would be in communication with the whole of West Melbourne by those streets?—The lands south of the river?

1096. Yes; I understand you that the river would be filled in by your scheme?—The portion below the cutting, between the cutting and the Saltwater River.

1097. And the whole of the land would be in communication with West Melbourne, to be laid out upon any plan that might be proposed?—Yes: it would be no longer Coode's Island; it would be a portion of the mainland.

1098. Do you think it would be desirable to fill in the river below that point, where it is proved, by observation and experiments made, that the new channel devised by Sir John Coode would be quite inadequate to carry away such a flood as that of 1865, and that a great portion of it must go down the old channel?—I was speaking to a very high authority upon that subject lately, and he said that it required but very little additional excavation to make a new channel able to carry off all the water.

1099. I ask that question upon this basis—that there was an old flood-mark of 1849 at Dights Falls, and the flood in 1863 was just the same, consequently they knew what the quantity was, it was a mere matter of calculation; I made the calculation, and it was such an immense quantity that the new cut could not carry it off!—The new cut is a great deal wider than the river itself, and it is simply a matter of excavation to make it carry as much water as the old channel.

1100. The calculation I made was based upon the Coode channel being cut to the full depth he proposed, 25 feet; we are only cutting it 20 feet?—I think it would be most desirable to fill the river bed in; but, if it is not possible, it is quite possible to bridge it, where and as often as you like.

1101. And if there was a bridge, you think that Coode Island would be a valuable adjunct to the city?—Yes, I do; I think it is a suitable place for docks.

1102. You visited England a few years ago?—Yes.

1103. Did you give much attention to this matter when travelling in England, and through Europe?—I did; in fact, of course, as an old railway man, railways are my hobby, and I spent a great deal of time and attention in picking up information wherever I could that would bear upon the railways of this colony, and after I came back I gave Mr. Service a long letter containing information that I had gathered, and he asked my leave to publish it in the papers.

1104. Your object being to give the benefit of your advice and experience to the country?—Yes, for no other purpose.
1105. And briefly, that which you have told us just now—Yes. Referring to what Mr. Hodgkinson asked me just now about buildings upon the low-lying land, we must bear in mind that we have plenty of examples of the finest cities being built upon low land. St. Petersburg, the finest city in Europe, and Chicago, are built upon thousands of acres of marsh land; San Francisco has been half reclaimed from the sea; about a thousand acres of Boston was marsh. I think that the value of the West Melbourne land consists in the fact that upon it without any subways or bridges, and that justifies any alteration that can be made now. I believe if it is not done by this generation it will be done by those following us, and they will give us very liberal credit for being sharp people. After all, this city is only fifty years of age, and everything we see around us has been done within our lifetime. Land is worth £300 a foot at the foot of Collins-street, where you are cut off by State railways that, I say, can be accommodated elsewhere with equal advantage to the travelling public and to the Railway department. Of course, it is an individual opinion—

1106. But would it be an equal advantage to have the goods shed half-a-mile off?—I think it would be no disadvantage: a large portion of our goods traffic is done below the gas-works at present.

1107. We are told to-day that 90 per cent. of the goods traffic is taken to warehouses?—Yes.

1108. If this is a city of fifty years old, look a century forward, and where would you consider, with proportionate growth, the centre of the city would be likely to be?—I should think about where we are now.

1109. And in what direction is the city to extend in those future years?—If it is to be a great commercial city, it must extend to the west; if it is to be a city like Paris, it does not matter which way— it can go to Brunswick or Coburg.

1110. If it is to be a commercial port, there must be accommodation for shipping, and the class of business connected with shipping?—You must take advantage of your water frontages, and extend the city in that direction, I consider.

1111. If there was a bridge below the new cut to Coode Island, the city would be more likely to extend from Melbourne towards Sandridge, or on both sides of the cut, rather than go into the low-lying lands upon the western side of the Yarra; does a swamp railway extend an enormous mass of dangerous matter from that old Manse depot?—I do not know whether you were in the colony at the time, but years ago all the night-soil from the city was poured into gutters and run into the swamp?—Yes; but Chicago is built upon seven feet of raised land. I say, decidedly, you must have the commercial portion of the city down there; I do not say private residences, but if you are to have the docks, and the railway station for goods, and the wharves for intercolonial steamers at that part of the city, you must have, necessarily, a large number of buildings in connection with those commercial facilities. What has made London the city it is, except that ships can go to London bridge. Glasgow was nothing till ships could go to Broomielaw bridge, and Liverpool in the same way; and it will be the same with Melbourne. Melbourne is good enough for us, but those coming after us need something more.

1112. Your first proposition is to add this portion, coloured blue, now the property of the Harbour Trust, to the railway reserve.—Yes.

1113. For goods, and carriages, and engine-sheds, and so on?—Yes.

1114. Secondly, you propose to make the portion lying between Flinders-street and Collins-street a passenger station?—Yes.

1115. The third, as I understand it, is that you abolish the whole of the railway reserve except it?—Yes, and the viaduct comes from North Melbourne, skirts the gas-works. A great deal of money has been spent in the last two years at North Melbourne; a new station and high-level bridge have been built; they, to some extent, interfere with the viaduct coming off at the Coburg junction. My idea was that the Coburg line should be thrown into the North-eastern line, and bring a line from thence skirting the gas-works, and from the viaduct, lines would run into the passenger station fronting on Collins-street.

1116. You propose to carry the whole from the North Melbourne station to the passenger station at Collins-street upon a viaduct?—Yes, and that viaduct would also have to be used for goods purposes for a certain distance; you come off the viaduct with the goods trains to a lower level.

1117. Then a part of your scheme is a connexion between Flinders-street station and Spencer-street?—Yes; Parliament has authorized that, and I look upon it as most necessary; in fact, that as the means of connexion between the two systems is absolutely necessary, it is the wisest thing ever done to connect the eastern, northern, and western systems by such a viaduct.

1118. You have heard, I daresay, what the city ask for—extension of certain streets for access to the docks?—Yes.

1119. Do you think they are justified in asking for such extensions, looking to the future, and the opportunities of getting to the docks, and to the land beyond?—For simple access to the docks, I believe even Flinders-street, if of sufficient width, would carry the dock traffic.

1120. Here is a large area of land coloured yellow, for which no provision is made, if this railway is allowed to remain uncrossed—looking at it from that point, are they in your opinion justified in asking that extensions be made, first, to the docks, then to the land beyond?—I do not see how you are to do it, for the whole of the land is reserved, either for the railways or the Harbour Trust—there is no provision for the yellow land at all.

1121. Except provision is made for it, it is isolated?—For city purposes it is isolated, unless you can continue the portions of the city across the land we are on at the present time it is not work while considering the scheme at all. I consider to carry viaducts across Collins or Bourke streets is unnecessary for access to the docks.

1122. You consider the land coloured yellow is worthless to the city except your scheme is carried out?—Yes, and you would have your docks in the centre of the city, which is unprecedented in the world.

1123. You consider the yellow land belongs to the city?—I do not know anything about the municipal boundaries; I know it is outside the city boundary.

1124. Land is not worth anything like £300 a foot when you get there?—Footscray land will fetch £20 a foot in some places.

1125. No doubt; but land on the other side of the river will not bring more than 25s. or 30s.—Perhaps £3 or 4 a foot.

1126. Do you expect to get more for the yellow land than, say, £5 a foot at the outside?—I do, indeed. I am not looking at to-day, but say two or three generations ahead. It will take years to fill the
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land, and be years before it is available for sale; but as it is filled and put up for sale, I do not think it should be parted with unless it is valuable as city property. We have plenty of example on the other side of the river, where the Government of the day parted with land for a mere song that is now worth twenty or thirty times what it was eight years ago.

1127. I thought one part of your scheme was the reduction of our debt by the sale of this land.—

Yes.

1128. And yet you say it would take years and years to put it upon the market.—The present railway reserve is filled now. Suppose the buildings were taken off the present Spencer-street reserve, it would require very little filling to be able to put the land in the market, and a very large sum of money would be realized immediately on other railway accommodation is provided, and if the land with the cost the Railway department is put to?—

I say, recoup them; but of course the expenditure must be incurred first.

1130. Do you know about what the expenditure has been upon railways in this country; is it not £80,000,000?—I think not quite that, but it is close up to it.

1131. The Chairman of the Commissioners says that, from his experience in England, the sale of this land, or putting it to any other purpose than that of railways would depreciate the capital value of the railways of this country by the sum of five or six millions at least. What do you think of that statement?

I do not think that is the case: I do not think it could be, for this reason, you give the railways equal facilities and as much area as they have at the present time.

1132. In another place f—In another place, but the place will be even more central in a few years' time than Spencer-street is now, if the docks are to be at the west end of Melbourne. With the large increase of intercolonial traffic year by year, and the large extension of railways, the city must follow these commercial facilities.

1133. Was not this scheme of yours somewhat changed in its character lately, and developed this new passenger station between Collins-street and Flinders-street; was not your original scheme one that made the central passenger station at the Hobson's Bay terminus?—Yes; I was under the impression that it would give sufficient accommodation.

1134. Now you have altered your opinion upon that point?—Not to any great extent; because the woodcut that illustrated my letter in the Argus showed no extension of Flinders-lane; that was left purposely, in order to put additional passenger accommodation at that point if wanted.

1135. Does not it point to this conclusion—that, even in your own mind, railway requirements are an unknown quantity?—I do not know that; we can estimate them with some degree of certainty, and, if 213 acres are set apart for a goods station, that will be adequate for a long time, for a large portion of the business now done in the railway yards will be done at the docks in future. The grain and wool will be taken alongside the ship, and taken out at once, instead of being unloaded in the Railway yards; and the goods imported will go from the docks direct to the bonds, and not to the railway stations at all, or into the railway sheds, as they do at present; therefore, the same amount of accommodation will not be needed for goods imported and exported.

1136. But within the short space of five years you have altered your opinion in regard to this passenger station—you now propose two passenger stations. Might you not in another five years time have come to the conclusion that, after all, the Railway department had better stick to all the land it has got and to have the central station where it is better fitted for the general public?—I do not see that you have any more accommodation if you stick to the place where you are than if you do as I suggest.

1137. You propose to put the goods station a long way away—how would the country people look upon that?—It is mere nothing; it is only a gunshot from here to the gas-works. When you look at the large cities of Europe, and see the long way that goods have to be carted from the railway stations, the distance from the gas-works is nothing, it should not be considered.

1138. The only improvement now to be carried out that is a permanent obstacle to your scheme is the dock accommodation?—I know it is a very serious matter to consider, but I simply put it forward as a suggestion, not as a very practical man, but still a man with a good deal of colonial experience, and perhaps a good deal of common sense bearing on these matters; and my opinion is that it would be a very desirable thing to put the docks up upon Coode Island—it would be done at half the expense—and even if you put the docks at the present site there is no ground to believe that they would stand, the sub-strata are so soft; and another thing, the navigation of the Yarra will be very much interfered with if the dock entrance is to be where it is proposed at present, whereas, if you put the docks upon Coode Island, the entrance would be out of the way altogether.

1139. And very far away?—No.

1140. How much?—As the crow flies, I suppose, half-a-mile—in fact, not so much as that.

1141. The rest of your scheme can be carried out at any time, if the new station be built in a line with Collins-street?—Yes, decidedly.

1142. Fifty or a hundred years hence?—Yes.

1143. Always provided that we do not put them across the lines of streets?—Yes. I know it is a matter of impossibility to rush a thing of this sort, it is a matter of such magnitude, but taking into consideration the immense advantages to be derived by those coming after us, it is worth considering.

1144. You tell us you have never taken any levels, or examined the ground; on the other hand we have Sir John Coode telling the Harbour Trust where the docks should be, and we have the trust with its engineer, all responsible men, deciding to carry out the work, after long discussion, and availing themselves of the best opinion taken from the man building upon a certain scheme, and you tell us that that talent is wrong—and you tell us, without any reason, except that simply it is your opinion?—No, I give you very good reason for it; I say it is proved to the satisfaction of the Harbour Trust, and everyone else, that the land now reserved for dock purposes is very unsuitable, and it will cost an immense amount of money to build docks there at all; and then, it is a question how far they will be a success; whereas, on the opposite side of the river, there is land known to be admirably suited for docks, and if the excavation is made upon Coode's Island, and faced with red gum, it will last for generations; and I say, for all practical purposes, it is quite near enough to the city. I remember, when I was a boy, St. Katherine's were the docks of London; after that they went down to Blackwall, and now they have gone down to
Gravescend, to the Tilbury docks, twenty miles from London—that is near enough for London, and I say it would be a great mistake to have our docks in the middle of the city of Melbourne.

1145. Have you a plan of your scheme and description?—I have a copy of the little plan that the Argus published.

1146. In your scheme did you draw the docks you proposed?—No.

1147. You proposed to connect them with the new cut and the Saltwater river as well?—No.

1148. With which?—The Saltwater river.

1149. Why not both?—I have no reason why not; I leave it to practical men to say which it should be—[Handing in a plan].

1150. Assuming that your scheme is not entertained, and that the docks are to remain where they are proposed to be, would you consider, if that piece of land south of Collins-street to Flinders-street was taken from the control of the Railway department, and they were supplied with an equal area of land to the north of Dudley-street (marked D), or to the west of their present boundary, north of the gas-works, that they would be materially injured, especially if the money derived from the sale of that land was devoted to railway purposes to allow those streets to be extended—Collins-street and Little Collins-street—through that land?—No, I think it would be an advantage; but I would not advocate the northern land being used, because it would cost an immense amount of money to purchase it. But the blue is State property already, and if an exchange of that sort could be made it would be very desirable.

1151. But if an equal amount was given out of the yellow land, would it be a great injury to the railway?—I look upon it that that land is of no use at all, and it will be many generations before the land they now have will be required for traffic purposes.

1152. Do you think it is imperative there should be a connexion with Flinders-street and Spencer-street stations?—Yes, I do, decidedly. I think level crossings and level roads, such as we have in Flinders-street, are very objectionable.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourneed to the 14th April, at Half-past ten o'clock.

THURSDAY, 14TH APRIL, 1887.

Present:

The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.L.A., in the Chair;

The Hon. A. J. Wallace, M.L.A.,

" R. Burrowes, M.L.A.,

" W. Anderson, Esq., M.L.A.,

J. Laurens, Esq., M.L.A.,

J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.L.A.,

P. Wright, Esq., M.L.A.,

W. Maddox, M.L.A.,

W. Cain, Esq.,

A. J. Skene, Esq.

Joseph Brady, Esq., M. Inst. C.E., examined.

1153. You are engineer to the Melbourne Harbour Trust?—Yes.

1154. How long have you been in that position?—Ten years.

1155. You know the locality about which the Commission is making inquiry, the swamp?—I know the West Melbourne swamp very well.

1156. Have you ever considered the proposition that has been made to extend the streets of Melbourne?—No, it has not come under my notice in any way; it formed no particular part of my duties to consider it.

1157. Do you think it would be advisable for the Railway department to give up any of the land between the present line of Spencer-street and the new dock?—I do not. I do not see what could be possibly gained by it, because, if you refer to the map, you will see that immediately behind the railway terminus all the ground is occupied by the Harbour Trust dock. The Harbour Trust have adopted the lines of that dock, and, no doubt, so far as they are capable of doing it, they fully intend to carry it out. There is no object that I can see in extending the streets across the railway line in that direction, except one; I think La Trobe-street might be carried through with very great advantage.

1158. What would be the reason for the extension of La Trobe-street?—That it has peculiar advantages; on the one side it approaches the dock in a bluff about 30 feet above the railway level on the eastern side, and there would be less difficulty in crossing the railway lines, and fewer railway lines to cross at that point, and you can get down to the level of the dock with less difficulty than you could at other places.

1159. You think the docks would form as much of an obstruction to the extension as the railway works do at the present moment?—No doubt. As far as my reading goes, and that is all I know about the affair, "Extension of the city westwards" is to extend the city to the docks.

1160. Do you think it would be wise for the Government to part with any of the land that is at present held by them between the railway and the docks?—I do not, except the improvement of Flinders-street, which it is agreed upon by all parties is an absolute necessity.

1161. Which mode of access do you think is the best to reach the docks?—Flinders-street, without doubt.

1162. Do you think that that would be a sufficient means of access for a long time?—I think so.

1163. What width would Flinders-street be as compared with its present width at that point?—The roadway would be 99 feet wide, that is a chain and a half. It should be preserved that width, but where it passes warehouses and wharves you must add 20 feet on each side for lorries and carts to back in without interrupting the traffic. A lorry with a pair of horses, backed in occupies 20 feet.

1164. Was not there a provision to make the street much wider at a point west of the junction with Spencer-street?—I do not think so. There is no object in doing it. The street is not wider down.
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1155. Is it not wider west of Spencer-street?—No.
1156. It is very narrow now, is it not?—It is.
1157. What is its width?—Thirty feet between the kerb stones, and the Railway department occupy 12 feet of that. It is a very dangerous place when trains go down; there are many accidents that we do not hear of. I have myself seen one cab smashed in a very simple way, and there have been others. No river has been lost.
1158. Do you think the opening of La Trobe-street to the docks would relieve Flinders-street to any extent?—I do not know. I think it would divert some traffic to North Melbourne.
1159. One proposition made is to construct the docks upon the other side of the river from where it is proposed to construct them?—It would not do at all. Any dock, to be of use, should be in direct communication with the railway system—in the midst of it. I could understand your taking the docks to Coode Island if you took the railway station there also. Wherever you have the large terminal station, there the docks should be.
1170. Do you think it is better to take the dock to the station, instead of moving the whole south, and away from the people?—I think so. The station is in an excellent position where it is. In all the great cities of Europe we hear that they are buying up constantly large blocks of land by Act of Parliament to bring the railway stations near to the cities, at enormous outlay; not to increase the warehouse-room, but to increase the railway room.
1171. You are aware that there is a very large area of Crown land beyond the docks?—I am.
1172. Do you think a road across the river would be a sufficient access to those lands?—Yes, I think there must be a good bridge across the docks; that the Harbour Trust must provide. And there ought to be a road 100 feet wide along the bank of the Yarra as far as Footscray. There is nothing to prevent your bridging the river along the bank in two or three places, if you wish to do so. There will be no ship traffic to hinder your having a floating or swing bridge, to open two or three times in the day for local traffic. There is no doubt Coode Island will be connected in that way; it will be very valuable land, and it is all Crown land, except a strip along the border; the West Melbourne swamp will be used in the same way, and you can reach it from North Melbourne station. The road should go to the junction of the Yarra and the Saltwater, and a bridge be thrown across to Footscray. As to making use of West Melbourne swamp for building purposes, the difficulty would be solved by extending Footscray eastwards; the name is nothing.
1173. The extension of Footscray would meet no one's views?—I have no doubt that all the Crown lands, Coode Island, and Fisherman's Bend, and down to the sea will certainly be occupied. Melbourne is only a small place at present, considering its geographical position. It must grow in some direction; and you have a great deal of Crown land at present. You have 1,100 acres between the new canal and the sea, beside Coode Island, altogether unoccupied.
1174. What extension of whar夫ge do you propose to make along the river westward; how far, say, from the gasworks?—From the end of the present wharf; a contract will be let next week, for 1,370 feet to the entrance to the dock.
1175. Do you propose to extend the wharfage beyond the entrance to the dock, as well?—We leave a gap for the dock entrance, and we propose to carry forward 600 feet or 700 feet of wharfage west of the dock entrance, to provide for the Railway department, if it will sit them, but they must be consulted first; that is for coal purposes.
1176. All along the margin of the river you will leave a road 100 feet wide, irrespective of the wharves?—Yes; the wharf itself will be 40 feet wide; then there will be sheds and blank spaces alternately of 300 feet all the way along. On the north wharf we shall have five sheds, beside what we have now, and between the back of the sheds and the back of the next row of sheds facing the docks there will be a space of, at least, 140 feet of roadway; that will be 100 feet for roadway, and about 20 feet on each side to accommodate drays and vehicles of all kinds, so as not to interrupt the through stream of traffic; and there will be ample room for tramway lines.
1177. Then, all the streets required to utilize the Crown lands would cross at right angles to the river, and run into the road along the river bank?—I do not follow you.
1178. You leave a road 100 feet wide along the river bank?—Yes. There ought to be a little broader limit, perhaps, to admit of widening the river slightly. It is not intended to carry wharfage along at present, but in the future, no doubt, it will be done.
1179. In laying off the Crown lands, the streets would run as nearly as possible at right angles to the road along the river?—That matter, of course, would be arranged by the Crown. It would be the most convenient thing for them to do, I should imagine. There is no doubt the road along there should be formed. The Harbour Trust have two chains in width of it; and, at least, one chain of it, or a chain and a-half north of it, should be devoted to a public highway.
1180. If Bourke-street was extended to the docks, from your experience as an engineer, which of the two roads do you think would be chosen by persons bringing goods, Flinders-street or Bourke-street?—No doubt in the world, Flinders-street; because Flinders-street is only 8 feet above low-water level at the crown of the road; that is the street level for our roads. Before you get into Bourke-street, you must cross the railway line, which, I believe, is 30 feet (I do not know for certain) above the sea, and then you have 10 feet or 17 feet to add to it. You have to mount 47 feet or 48 feet to get into Flinders-street, and that is all work upon the colly; it is all a question of haulage. I see the railway engineers state in their evidence that there would be an incline of 1 in 20 on the dock side, and I believe there would be; but they must know, for they have the levels. You cannot get under the railway to advantage.
1181. What you propose really is, a street—a wide street—along the river, leading the whole way from the present Flinders-street to Footscray?—Yes.
1182. As shown upon that plan?—Yes; it is marked there. That is what it ought to be.
1183. In that way you would have ample access to the docks, and to the land beyond, known as the West Melbourne swamp?—Yes, without doubt.
1184. And you would have it in the best way, because it is perfectly level?—In my opinion, it is the best way.
1185. I suppose the river between the new cut and Footscray would act as a sort of natural dock?—Of course; but what the river will be used for will be a live-by place, to repair shipping, and for a dock-
yard, and graving docks, and for foundries, and things of that kind; and it is a fine waterway. There will be no through traffic by steamers, but there will be a traffic from the river, including Footscray.

1186. So that the Yarra north of Coode Island would be practically a dock?—No doubt of it; or, rather, a canal.

1187. You spoke of extending the wharfage, and letting a contract next week?—The present wharf stops about here.—(pointing to the plan.)

1188. Then you spoke of an extension of that for the good of the railway?—Yes, it is sketched here I am prepared to the Harbour Trust that we should put a wharf about 500 feet long to deliver coal to the Railway Department. The Railway department have now about 500 feet of wharf in another place, built by the Harbour Trust, but occupy really about 1,100 or 1,200 feet, including the sidings. If we can get that, we shall get five or six ships' berths. The Railway department have been communicating with, but we do not know their decision at present.

1189. In your opinion, would the roads hatched with red upon the plan give ample road access? I mean the continuation of Flinders-street, as modified, and La Trobe-street?—There are Flinders-street, La Trobe-street, Dudley-street, and North Melbourne bridge.

1190. Is it your opinion that those roads would give ample access to the docks and to the West Melbourne swamp?—Yes, ample access; as far as the Trust is concerned La Trobe-street is of no earthly use to them, they do not want it; but if the people of the city want access it would be a very good place.

1191. You observe that the continuation of La Trobe-street would go directly on to your principal pier in the docks?—Yes.

1192. Would that be an advantage?—No doubt of it.

1193. Is it not likely that the intercolonial steamers would come to that principal pier, and that the light traffic would go over La Trobe-street into the city?—I do not know. Assume that the pier is built—if you were building a passenger steamer at it, of course whenever they land their passengers they want the nearest approach to the city to get away. Sir John Coode proposed to form some of the principal vessels at the wharf here, and probably he had it in his mind that Flinders-street would be the best approach to the city, and no doubt it is so, because it is a dead level up to the Custom-house.

1194. And that would not only be the main means of access to the dock and West Melbourne swamp, but also to Coode Island?—Certainly it would, because you pass the junction of the new canal, and you have to go a very small distance to get a favourable place for a bridge, and you could have another bridge out of Coode Island, at the western end of the new cutting, facing Whitehall-street, at the south end of Footscray, and a mile and a quarter down, where it would not interfere at all with the ocean traffic, because between that and Footscray the river would be used merely for local traffic. Each one of those bridges should have a movable swing in it.

1195. Is it a fact that the owners of ocean-going ships object to have their ships docked in fresh water?—No, that is not true.

1196. Is it an advantage or a disadvantage?—It is an advantage. You find that all owners of ocean-going ships with iron bottoms make it an object to come up to the Melbourne wharf, because there is fresher water there, and fresh water kills the weeds and thus saves docking.

1197. Then the whole of that traffic would concentrate upon Flinders-street?—As regards this portion of the dock it would.

1198. And the bridges you propose to cross the river?—If you have one bridge on Coode Island I think it is sufficient. That makes Flinders-street and its prolongation to Footscray a main roadway.

1199. Then the whole traffic down to the docks, you think, and a portion of the traffic to Coode Island, would be taken through Flinders-street?—Yes, I think so.

1200. Do you consider Flinders-street is sufficiently wide to accommodate that traffic?—I know perfectly well it is not at present.

1201. How would you propose to widen it?—I would widen it, in the line of Flinders-street.

1202. I speak of Flinders-street, east of the Sir Charles Fortham hotel?—Yes.

1203. Do you consider Flinders-street there is sufficiently wide to take that accumulation of traffic as well as what it takes at present?—I do not see why it should not.

1204. Have you considered that?—I have not considered it. It is a question of traffic and the regulation of traffic.

1205. Do you know the width of Flinders-street?—99 feet.

1206. Is there any reason why the whole of the land between the north side of Flinders-street and the wharf should not be known as Flinders-street, and be used so?—It was gazetted so.

1207. It was to be used for the railway viaduct?—No, the railway viaduct is upon the south side of the street.

1208. You could not have longitudinal traffic under the viaduct?—Yes you can; you can put in pairs of columns and run under it the whole way if you like.

1209. You think the whole of the traffic can be accommodated in Flinders-street?—Yes, I think so.

1210. Have you read the opinions of the city of Melbourne Corporation upon the matter?—I have not read it carefully.

1211. They say Flinders-street is not sufficient. Are you prepared to say that they are wrong?—No, I will not say so; because they have all the facts, and I have not.

1212. Then they are as likely to be right as you are?—Barring statistics, I think Flinders-street is sufficient.

1213. There is already a large and increasing traffic from the south side of the river where the foundries are now?—Yes.

1214. It has been spoken of to erect a bridge at the bottom of Spencer-street, has it not?—Yes, but that will not be done.

1215. You cannot answer that?—No.

1216. It has been spoken of?—It has, for ten years.

1217. There is a steam past there at present as a substitute for a bridge?—Yes.

1218. It was intended to bridge the traffic of the south side of the river to Flinders-street?—It is merely a stand-by till they get the bridge.
1219. And it does some of the traffic?—It does most of it, I believe.

1220. If there was a bridge there it would bring much more traffic?—I would rather not say anything about that, because a bridge renders all the upper part of the river useless.

1221. If the traffic of the south of the river increases, do you want to bring that traffic to the city?—But do they want to come to the city? I deny the fact. The south side is a city of itself.

1222. You are aware that the Falls-bridge is being widened just now?—Yes, to 190 feet, I suppose.

1223. And the Harbour Trust, of which you are the engineer, thought it necessary to widen that bridge, which is shown by their contributing?—For a reason.

1224. That reason not being to spend money upon it without utilizing it?—No; but the reason was to get sufficient space to carry tramways across, and there was no other reason.

1225. But the increasing traffic of that part of Melbourne must be taken across the bridge?—Yes, and the two bridges are very fine, ample bridges—Falls Bridge and Prince's Bridge. You do not want to go to the heart of Melbourne with the traffic from the south. I say the south will be a great city very soon, and they will, perhaps, want you to come to their side. You will have an immense city upon the flanks, and another upon the island, and all this space will be filled with houses.

1226. Then what is the necessity for bringing the railway station to the heart of the city, as you say, now that it will not be long the heart of the city?—But the railway station is there now; why take it away?

1227. The Council of the city consider that it would be a greater inconvenience to the traffic of the city to put it north of Bourke-street. If this is not the heart of the city, and you think the traffic is not coming here, who do you think it necessary to have the railway station here?—I say, why move the railway station? I say, what is the good of taking the line of Collins-street past it? The line of Collins-street is to form the terminus of the railways, I understand; but there is no reason for taking the street to the corner of the gasworks at all at an incline of 1 in 20.

1228. This is not correct?—It is correct. I know the grades well, and you must cross all the railway lines upon the level.

1229. If Collins-street is carried cut upon this plan, and the station kept north of Collins-street, you can get a better incline than 1 in 20?—Of course, it depends upon how you cross the line.

1230. And as to bringing it against the gasworks, whether it is easier to divert the street?—Yes, there are streets here and north of the gasworks a chain wide.

1231. The substance of what I ask is this: Do you consider that Flinders-street, from the Sir Charles Hotham hotel east, is sufficient to take all the extended traffic to the docks, and what accumulates by crossing the river, either by a bridge or by the punt?—That is a question that I have not studied. I would rather you asked someone else about that; but I know that Flinders-street is an immensely wide street.

1232. The City Council ask for the extension of the streets on the ground that Flinders-street is not sufficient for the present traffic and the great increase of it; and as the city must develop, other provision should be made for getting into the heart of the city by other streets?—Another point may be as well reflected upon by the Commission: you have already got all the shipping traffic to carry upon four wheels from Sandridge to town, and the idea of bridging the docks here is to transfer the Sandridge traffic to this spot, and have safe haulage. You will have no more ships here than you have at Sandridge.

1233. But, looking at the future, will there be no more ships come here?—Yes; but this will not be the only dock you will make, though it is the first you ought to make.

1234. Where will it extend to then?—Down the river.

1235. If the city is to follow the traffic down, it will go down the river too?—That does not follow. London does not follow the docks, and the only reason they build docks down the river is because they cannot build them in London. The docks go down to Graveshend, 30 or 30 miles down the river; but there is no extension of London in that direction.

1236. Is the traffic of the docks brought into London?—It must be taken into London, or through London, by railway; and no doubt it is.

1237. And the same applies to the extended docks—it must come into the city?—That applies upon where you build your warehouses. When you say, "Come into the city," it means into Mr. John Smith's warehouse, or Mr. John Brown's warehouse, or somewhere difficulty about it.

1238. It narrows itself down to this, is the one street sufficient to carry the traffic of this great future dock extension?—I say it carries all the traffic at the present moment of all the shipping at Sandridge and other places.

1239. But a century hence, assuming the progress of the country is to keep pace with the progress of the last 50 years?—It does not at all follow that all the goods from this dock will come to Melbourne.

1240. Where will they go to?—To the country, a large part of them.

1241. The evidence here is that 90 per cent. of the goods landed here go to warehouses in the city before they go to the country?—A large portion of them no doubt do; but I do not suppose there is in any Melbourne warehouse-room enough to accommodate the shipping that will come to this place. What will be the result? You must build warehouses at the docks.

1242. But you must distribute from there?—You distribute it retail from there.

1243. Assuming that the goods are brought from the wharves into the city, I understood you to say that La Trobe-street with a bridge over was quite feasible, that bridge connecting with the new docks?—No, what I wish to put before you is this. In my opinion (I do not say I am right) the great artery of traffic will be in Flinders-street, because of its good level, and then is required the next best and easiest access, which is certainly La Trobe-street. Then beyond that you have Dudley-street, and then North Melbourne. North Melbourne does not accommodate the dock, but Dudley-street does.

1244. All the traffic now is in Flinders-street?—Yes.

1245. And that comprises not only heavy but light traffic?—Yes.

1246. If Lonsdale or La Trobe-street were opened it would take a great deal of the light traffic?—It would ease off the light traffic in this way, that if the dock were finished the natural outlet from it would be from the new jetty to La Trobe-street.
1247. What would be likely to be the gradient of La Trobe-street? — It would cross the railway by a bridge, and you must go down to the level of the docks. You have a longer distance on the east side. You can cross at the line at La Trobe-street because the railway there is in a cutting.

1248. La Trobe-street is sufficiently high to allow of the railway being crossed by an overbridge? — Yes.

1249. Then your opinion is that the access by those streets will be sufficient for the next hundred years? — I think Flinders-street, La Trobe-street, and Dudley-street would be sufficient for all time for that dock.

1250. Or for any buildings to be erected upon the swamp? — For all the buildings you can put surrounding that dock, and there will be sufficient space in width provided upon the road along the river bank to the West Melbourne swamp.

1251. Could the new bridge just erected at North Melbourne be utilized if docks were put lower down, at Footscray? — Of course, the crossing of the line at North Melbourne is of great service in utilizing the West Melbourne swamp, but it is of no service to the new docks.

1252. But I speak of new docks, lower down? — Yes, of course it would. I am not acquainted with the railway plans, but any bridge led through at North Melbourne ought to have main roads radiating from it through the West Melbourne swamp, so as to thoroughly utilize the land, which is very valuable.

1253. You mention the extension of Dudley-street. How would you propose to extend that street? — I do not know anything about that street extending into the city, but I know the approach would be sufficiently good inside of our ground to get into Dudley-street.

1254. Are you aware that there is less than eight feet between your Harbour Road level and the head of the railway bridge, about feet in the clear? — Is there a railway bridge over there now? — It is an under bridge, an under road — Then the under road would be all the better, as far as the dock is concerned.

1255. But there is only eight feet from the level of the rails to the level of the wharves? — I was not aware of that fact. Do you mean eight feet headway? — I think it is, but the plan shows it! — I see no great difficulty in providing additional headway at that particular point.

1256. Do you know the culvert, as it was called, that was closed at North Melbourne, that was found insufficient for the traffic to Footscray? — I cannot say that I know it.

1257. The necessity arose to close that culvert, and that necessitated the present overbridge, so how could you think of making an underbridge for an important approach to the dock? — That is a matter of detail that I cannot say that I have studied, but I say Dudley-street should be made a main artery of traffic. I think that is a matter of detail that the railway engineers are quite competent to get over if they are told to do it. It depends upon what height you want, you do not want to carry hay-carts through it.

1258. If you are going to make a road to the docks and to this large area it ought to be suitable for any traffic — it depends upon what you use it for. You know we carry an immense traffic through what is called the culvert, leading to Emerald Hill, where you have to dock your head, going through, if you are upon the top.

1259. That is only a makeshift, but this is to be a road for all time? — I say it is a matter of detail merely.

1260. Is there any difficulty in raising the rails there? — That I do not know.

1261. Are you as well acquainted with that as you are with the other aspect of the case? — No, I am fairly well acquainted with my own case.

1262. You answered the mayor that you preferred not to answer that in order to bring out the fact that it is not within your province? — I say, with all respect, when it is not within my province I merely say what I think. I do not speak with authority.

1263. One of the engineers said that the railways could be raised? — I think I have to doubt that it is merely a matter of engineering detail.

1264. You are not aware of any difficulty in raising the level at that point? — I am not, and I think Dudley-street ought to be a main street to the river.

1265. It ought to be of the full width? — It is of its full width now, is it not? — The street is not but the culvert? — For a distance it is not absolutely necessary. The width of the bridge need not necessarily be the full width of the street for that short distance.

1266. Mr. Madder asked you a question that I did not hear a clear answer to, that is, do you know the clear width of Flinders-street, east of the junction of Spencer-street, from the other side, on the river bank to the north line? — I think The Harbour Trust Act of Parliament, the last one, what is called The Amended Act of the Harbour Trust, almost settles that, and one member here will tell you that plans were drawn at the time defining the width of Flinders-street and of King-street, within certain limits, and of the street along the back of the Queen's wharf. The approach to the Queen's wharf was to be a chain and a half wide, and made by the Harbour Trust. The metalling of King-street from Flinders-street was to be made at the expense of the Harbour Trust, but the jurisdiction of the city still extends over the streets, though the Harbour Trust has to make and maintain them for all time, and between those streets there are certain portions of land of an irregular form, to be utilized. One was proposed to be cut up, made into a market, at one time. But I cannot see much object in whitening that street and making it 200 feet wide, for a street 100 feet wide is sufficiently wide.

1267. But does Flinders-street extend to the river-bank? — Flinders-street was at one time, without doubt, gazetted to the river-bank. One side of Flinders-street was the river-bank; but, I fancy, that the Act put before the Committee (and it was thoroughly threshed out at that time) provided that the street properly so called must be limited to a width, whatever it might be, and the lines were shown upon the schedules.

1271. In all the negotiations going on with the Government in reference to the exchange of roads, it was always considered that the land south of the 99 feet was under the control of the Crown, though it is really described in some of the old Gazettes, I think, as Flinders-street, which extends from its northern boundary to the river? — That is right; but the city and the Crown look upon it as Crown lands.
1272. But it being Crown lands, there is no difficulty in making the street from the north side to the wharf all street.—No; and I do not look upon the railway viaduct traversing it as any difficulty at all, because you can throw a pair of columns up on each side of the street, and you can have a road under the viaduct.

1275. Considering that Flinders-street will be the main artery for all the docks, is it not best to reserve the land north of the wharf?—What is the necessity for it, is a question I cannot answer. It would be very expensive, I believe, I believe.

1274. Is not some of that land under the control of the Harbour Trust now; some of the land between Flinders-street and the river?—No.

1275. None?—None of it.

1276. The wharf?—We have only got the wharf; and we have the road to the right. I am now speaking of eastward of Spencer-street.

1277. Eastward always?—We have not an inch of ground there.

1278. You have the wharves?—The Queen's wharf belongs to the Trust.

1279. Do you maintain that?—We have to maintain that, and the road at the back of it.

1280. But, if you make that road, it goes to show that it is not under the control of the City Corporation as a street?—I think you will find that all roads and thoroughfares under the control of the Trust are under the control of the city.

1281. They could not make you maintain a street that is under their control?—I am very sorry to say that they made a bargain to that effect, and we have spent £11,000 upon that already.

1282. Do the Trust do the work?—They have done all the work that has been done there up to the present time.

1283. Has the city always contended that the Trust should do this work?—I think so.

1284. Because the land is not within the limit of the street?—The land down to the border was, as a fact, under the control of the Corporation of the city of Melbourne, as being part and portion of Flinders-street.

1285. You have heard about the insufficiency of Flinders-street, or the alleged insufficiency of it, to carry the prospective traffic; do you think the presence of the tramway lines in that part of Flinders-street is not a serious obstruction to the traffic that would pass to and from the docks?—I am not prepared to say that it is. The tram certainly clears the street of an immense amount of vehicular traffic of a light class.

1286. If that tram were not laid down, would it not leave a large amount of roadway clear for the heavy traffic to pass?—I do not think so; it think you would have the street full of carriages, instead of an occasional tramcar. I think there is much less obstruction now with the trams than there would be without them. It requires a little care in traversing the streets, but the draymen and others seem to get used to it.

1287. In speaking about the extension, you said something about requiring 20 feet for a dray?—I am speaking now of a different class of subject. When you get to a dock or quay where you have a wharf 30 feet wide and a shed 50 feet wide, you must have access to the back of the shed, and room for a horse to back in with a dray, without blocking the street proper, and outside that shed you require, at least, 20 feet to be clear of the ordinary traffic.

1288. I understood you to say that, when all that was secured—the wharf, the shed, and the access to the shed—you thought a roadway of 99 feet would be sufficient?—Yes; and I still think so.

1289. How much would that be, in all, from the actual water of the river?—Take the portion where there is a double wharfage to illustrate it; from the front of the one wharf facing the river to the front of the other wharf facing the dock is 300 feet. That is ample for car-stands and loading of all kinds. There is 30 + 50 + 20; 30 of wharf, 50 of shed, and 20 standing room for horses and carts each side; that is 100 feet on each side, and 100 feet in the middle, and that is how the thing works itself out.

1290. Are you aware of the width of the strip that the Railway department is prepared to give for the purpose of widening it?—That is merely to preserve the alignment of Flinders-street, because Flinders-street now is extremely narrow and dangerous at that portion.

1291. But do you consider that what the Railway department is prepared to concede is quite sufficient for the purpose of widening Flinders-street at that point?—I think so. I know the Harbour Trust is quite content with it. If the railway authorities carried a line through, or had sheds of any kind there, people would have to back into them, and they would have to widen for that; but there are no sheds upon that side. I take it there will be retaining walls.

1292. But suppose they project the alignment of Flinders-street, what will become of the portion now marked blue, belonging to the Harbour Trust?—It was suggested at one time to put several large bonded warehouses there.

1293. Would the 20 feet be required at this portion of Flinders-street, between Spencer-street and the road by the gasworks—would the 20 feet for drays standing be required there?—That is another matter of detail. I think very likely it would, and the Harbour Trust will have to have the street 120 feet wide instead of 99 feet.

1294. Do you think the other street, running on the east side of the gasworks, would be a useful street?—Yes.

1295. Running from Flinders-street northwards, on the east side of the gasworks?—Yes.

1296. Then between the gasworks and Williams' yards would give useful access to the docks?—Yes.

1297. And to some extent that goes over the difficulties that exist owing to the south-west corner of the gasworks being closer to the water than the south-east?—Yes; I think that something might be done by cutting off a portion of that corner. My idea is to cut off that corner, as it is sketched here.

1298. Whose occupation is that land in?—The corporation. Give the corporation a little more space next to the gasworks for cutting off the angle.

1299. Would it not be better to remove them altogether; they only have permissive occupancy?—I do not know about that.

1300. Are you aware that the railway has applied for that land which is now in the occupation of the Melbourne corporation?—I was not aware of it.
1301. If they have applied for it, would you think they could connect to the railway system very easily?—Yes.

1302. By what means?—They have a railway line down there already.

1303. That is upon Harbour Trust land?—The blue portion is.

1304. How is it connected with the land occupied by the railway?—In this way, the Railway department have authority under our Act of Parliament to go through our land wherever they like with their railways.

1305. They would require to have a railway over the Harbour Trust land to occupy the quarter of an acre occupied by the City Council?—They have a railway there already.

1306. As a matter of fact, the whole of your land will be intersected by railways connected with the main system?—Yes, no doubt.

1307. And it would be a great advantage to the Trust to have it so?—Yes, the only condition being that they should lay their rails upon the level of the roads, to let cars go over.

1308. I understood you say that the Railway Commissioners would be wrong in giving up any of their land?—I do not know that I ought to give an opinion upon that. Allow me to put it in my own way. If I were one of the Railway Commissioners I would not give up an inch of land; they have not enough.

1309. Upon what do you base your opinion?—Because the railways are quite enough cramped in their land; they are more likely to require more, than less.

1310. Then you have studied the railway system?—To some extent I have.

1311. From what point of view?—As an ordinary traveller, and one living in Victoria.

1312. Not from a professional point of view?—No; I only give professional opinions upon what I am connected with, and nothing beyond.

1313. Nothing but an ordinary citizen's opinion?—Nothing more. It may be a very good opinion for all that; I am an old colonist.

The witness withdrew.

William Robert Martin examined.

1314. By the Commission.—You were connected with the department for some time?—About 27 years.

1315. What office did you hold?—I was an engineer.

1316. How long is it since you left the department?—Four years and a half.

1317. You have, then, seen the growth to a great extent of the traffic upon the Victorian railways?—Yes; I was upon the Victorian railways from the commencement.

1318. Have you had an opportunity since then of seeing other railway systems in the world?—Yes, over a good deal of the world.

1319. There has been a proposal made that the railway station be shifted further away from its present position. Is that in accord with the rule adopted in the countries you have recently visited in regard to railway accommodation?—Not at all; they have been always spending money to bring their stations as near as possible to the centres of population.

1320. One proposition is that the station should be shifted back to the line of Bourke-street. How would you view that proposition?—I think it would be a mistake.

1321. Or at the top of Collins-street?—I think it would be a mistake to alter it at all.

1322. Do you think the land between Collins-street and Flinders-street should be alienated by the department?—I think not; I think it is the very best position for the goods sheds.

1323. Do you think if a double area of land could be given instead that would compensate them?—I do not see where the Railway department could get more land so suitable.

1324. You have been visiting different countries?—Yes.

1325. Can you bring under notice any particular case that would illustrate what we are inquiring about?—I know in Paris, at present, they are going to spend £8,000,000 of money to bring the railways into the heart of the city.

1326. Eight millions sterling?—Yes.

1327. How far further?—All the stations are to be connected with one line, which shall go straight to the central market of Paris.

1328. How far will that be from the present principal station?—There are eight principal stations at Paris, and about 39 others as well.

1329. Is the object being to get the stations near to the population?—As near to the heart of the city as possible.

1330. Then you look upon the proposition before us a retrograde movement?—I think it would be a mistake.

1331. Do you think any land at all at present occupied by the Railway authorities should be given up?—I do not think so. I am quite sure they will want a great deal more than they have, in the future.

1332. Do you know the dock site?—Yes.

1333. What access would you give to the proposed docks?—I think if Flinders-street is extended to the full width of 90 feet, it would give plenty of access for years to come.

1334. When that becomes insufficient, how would you supplement it?—The easiest way is to carry La Trobe-street over the railway.

1335. Is there any engineering difficulty in that?—No, none at all. The railway is much narrower than it is further down; and another thing, La Trobe-street is much higher than the streets nearer this way, so that it is easier to get over the railway at that point than it is to get over any of the streets on this side of it.

1336. You think that Flinders-street will be sufficient for a long time?—Yes. A great number of years, I believe, will elapse before La Trobe-street needs to be extended.

1337. When La Trobe-street is extended, would the traffic follow it?—Some would, no doubt, but the main body of it would always go along Flinders-street. It is practically level, but at any other point of the railway you must have an incline. At La Trobe-street you must have an incline on the dock side of the railway. At the other streets there must be an incline on both sides.

Melbourne Extension.
1338. How far will the new station in Paris be from the central of the city?—There will be stations all over the city, forming the new scheme. At point the distance is about 20 chains. The new stations, especially the one going down to the great central market, is at the market itself. That is for the purpose of bringing goods to the great central market. All goods go from the stations, at present, by carts to market.

1339. When you speak of the central portions of Paris, do you speak of the commercial portion—the warehouse portion?—That is not easy to say. Paris is not like London. The commerce of Paris is scattered over a large portion of the city.

1340. When you speak of a market, is it a market where everything goes?—Yes, everything from the country, and then it is taken to the smaller markets all over Paris.

1341. Local markets?—Yes. All sorts of produce, meat and everything, go there first, and from there it is distributed to other and smaller markets. They are large markets, but small compared to the central market.

1342. There must be a variety of goods that never go to such a market as that, such as timber?—No, no; all goods to feed the population. That is what I speak of now.

1343. Then the great object of spending that large sum of money—$8,000,000, you say—is with a view to bring that class of goods?—That is only a small portion of the scheme.

1344. In a more central position in Paris?—Yes, that part of the scheme is.

1345. Is not the real object of this expenditure to connect the various lines?—They are connected at present by two circular lines, one within the walls, and the second further out.

1346. And this is a further connexion still?—Yes, still further within the walls.

1347. An inner circle?—Yes, in the heart of the city. There is another case; in Berlin they did a similar thing, they carried connection for most of the railways by a large viaduct through the heart of the town. They made a great central station within about a quarter of a mile of the heart of the city. That was done in the last seven or eight years.

1348. For goods or passengers?—Principally for passengers. In Vienna, when I was there, they were proposing to do the same thing and connect all the stations in the city in the same way.

1349. The connexion by viaduct proposed between Spencer and Flinders-streets will, to some extent, carry out the same idea in this city?—Yes, to some extent.

1350. Has any other idea occurred to your mind that might improve the accommodation?—I believe there is a proposition to connect the northern lines with the Hobson's Bay lines, but I do not know what it is.

1351. To come back to our subject; you referred to Flinders-street as in the future being 99 feet wide?—Yes, the extension.

1352. It is possible to make it very much wider, and seeing that it is such an important artery for traffic, would it not be desirable to do so?—I think it is a mistake to make a street too wide. The traffic wanders all over the street instead of keeping in line. I remember a place in Paris which was most dangerous to pass, it was in front of the Grand Opera-house, and the corporation narrowed it by making a railway in the centre, and now is it comparatively easy to cross. Before that it was dangerous to cross, because the traffic wandered all over the street instead of keeping line.

1353. Of course that is an exceptional case. There would be a great deal of traffic opposite the Opera-house. Seeing that the main traffic in goods centres here, should it not be widened seeing that there would be cars backed in?—I think 99 feet would be quite sufficient. You do not want more than two lines of traffic up and down.

1354. You have had a good deal of experience in your travels as to the centrality of the railway stations for passengers; in view of the fact that all our cars, cabs, and assess converge, no matter from what suburb, and come near the Hobson's Bay Railway station, do you consider that station fairly central for passengers, having in view Melbourne and suburbs?—Yes, I think it is a fairly central station.

1355. In a comparative sense?—Yes.

1356. Are you acquainted with the principal towns in England?—With London.

1357. With the railways there?—Yes.

1358. Liverpool?—No; I have not been there for many years.

1359. Manchester?—It is many years since I was there. I do not know it very well.

1360. Do you know the distances the principal stations there are from the general post office?—Where?

1361. London?—Some are not very far away; Cannon-street and Ludgate hill are not very far away.

1362. It is very close?—Ludgate-street is very close.

1363. Do you know the distance of Spencer-street from the post office?—Slightly over half a mile.

1364. Not in many towns are they so far away?—No, not large towns.

1365. If it was moved ten chains further off would it be very detrimental?—It would be ten chains worse, that is all.

1366. Would it be very detrimental to the traffic?—To the extent of ten chains it would. If it was ten chains nearer, all the better; I think the nearer you get to the heart of the population the better.

1367. If you could get ten chains further up Collins-street all the better?—Yes, if it was possible.

1368. But if the city of Melbourne is to extend in this direction, if you move it in that way that would be nearer the centre?—But Melbourne will not extend that way. Melbourne will not go into the swamp. It is very unhealthy, and the foundations are very bad and expensive.

1369. In what way will Melbourne extend?—It will extend by pulling down the old small buildings and putting up higher ones. It will extend upwards.

1370. Do you think it will extend laterally?—Not a great deal.

1371. Do you think the West Melbourne swamp, coloured yellow upon that map, should be retained for railway purposes?—I think it is highly suitable for docks, and if the railway want it it might be useful for them; but it is a little far away for the railway.

1372. But you said that you thought they would soon find they had not sufficient land?—Yes, I think in 20 years they will find they have not sufficient land.

1373. Then would not the yellow land be useful?—Yes, it would be good unless they could buy land, and that would be very expensive.
1374. Then you are of opinion they should keep all they have got?—Yes, that is my opinion.  
1375. If they did require the land, coloured yellow, as you think they will, for what purposes will they require it?—For the purpose of traffic, as the traffic increases.  
1376. How would you approach the land if the traffic increases to that extent?—They would use it for sidings of different kinds.  
1377. But where is the traffic to come and go?—Of course I am not prepared with a scheme for a railway line. You are going to make a scheme for a railway station.  
1378. You think it will require extended accommodation?—Yes, no doubt they will.  
1379. You must have in mind the purpose it will be wanted for?—For traffic.  
1380. Then how are the horses and drays, and foot passengers of the city, to find access to the traffic?—I am not prepared at this moment to say, but the crossing at Dudley-street can be improved and they can get out that way, and they can go out by Flanders-street when it is extended.  
1381. Do you know that the City Corporation thought Flanders-street was too crowded at present with traffic?—No.  
1382. And by the addition of traffic it will become more so?—You mean the present Flanders-street?  
1383. Yes?—I think if the traffic is properly regulated the street is quite large enough for all the traffic that is there, and will be for a long time to come.  
1384. They think differently?—Then there is a difference of opinion.  
1385. Do you think it would be desirable if Collins-street were extended through, to divert a lot of the heavy traffic, such as timber and coals, wool, and things of that kind, through into the main street of the city. Would it be a wise thing to do?—Into Collins-street?  
1386. If Collins-street were extended through and went down to the docks, would it be a desirable thing to divert the heavy traffic into it?—No, I do not think it would. The gradients are very heavy in Collins-street.  
1387. Apart from that, would it be a wise thing?—No, I do not think it is a street intended for traffic of that class.  
1388. The same objection would apply to La Trobe-street?—No.  
1389. A different class of street?—Yes.  
1390. Is it not the practice in continental cities to provide a certain class of traffic going there at all?—I do not know whether there is a law to that effect, but I never saw any traffic of that kind in the streets of Paris, so I suppose there must be a law.  
1391. Is not Collins-street, as at present existing here, a sort of street that would be excluded?—Decidedly, if such a law existed, it would.  
1392. You say the grades would be against Collins-street?—Yes.  
1393. How would the grades affect the La Trobe-street extension?—That has only a grade one way.  
1394. It would be a grade against the heavy traffic going into the city?—No, I think not. It is not so heavy going up. But you may be right; I do not know.  

The witness withdrew.  

John O'Malley, examined  
1395. By the Commission.—What office do you hold? I am now retired from the service, after twenty-six years. I have been two or three years away from the railways.  
1396. What office did you hold? I held the office of Stationmaster here six or seven years, and, after that, District Traffic Superintendent for the North-eastern and the Western lines.  
1397. You have heard of the proposals to give up portion of the railway ground, to extend the streets?—Yes, I believe it is necessary that the traffic should be carried on in the direction of the wharves and docks.  
1398. You think that, in order to afford facilities to that traffic, the railway yard must be given up to a certain extent?—South of Bourke-street. I have, if you will allow me, a sketch I have made to illustrate my views here; it may explain my views more clearly—[producing and exhibiting the same].—It is not a sketch of the plan of the city of Melbourne and suburbs.  
1399. But does that sketch disclose how much land would be given up by the Railway department?—South of Bourke-street—[the witness explained the plan].  
1400. In this sketch that you produce you propose that the Railway department should give up all the land south of Bourke-street?—Yes, unless there were any difficulties, which I am not aware of.  
1401. What would be the object in your mind in giving up the land; simply the disposal of it?—Net alone the disposal of it, but giving easy access to the wharves and docks.  
1402. The railway station, then, would be pushed back to Bourke-street?—Yes, and a very central position, too.  
1403. According to this plan, Bourke-street is produced to Jubilee Broadway, which is the name you give it?—Yes.  
1404. Right down to the Yarra?—Yes.  
1405. That would leave seven or eight new streets?—Yes.  
1406. From your knowledge of the railway traffic and its development, do you think that the Department could, with advantage to itself, give up so much land?—I really think it could, because with the disposal of that land it could lay out and construct all the new works without encroaching upon the railway revenue or the railway funds, and it would have sufficient land upon the swamp to extend goods, wool, and grain sheds, yards and sidings.  
1407. Do you not think the people in the country particularly, would object to be placed at a further distance?—I hardly think they would, because it is immediately in the centre, to which you will have access by trams very shortly, and they would go all over the city and suburbs.  
1408. Are you aware that they propose to build a viaduct connecting this railway line with the Hobson's Bay line?—Yes; but I do not think that is necessary; it would be a useless expense. The trams will answer all the purposes, except the conveyance of passengers, and the outer circle would answer for the conveyance of goods and cattle from the Gippsland line, and open a communication and facilitate communication in that way, and interchange of rolling-stock.
1409. You do not approve, then, of the junction of the two stations?—No; I think it would be
hampering the suburban traffic at the Flinders-street and Spencer-street stations.
1410. If this land were sold, would you credit it all to the Railway department?—Decidedly, except
the streets. Of course, the Corporation should give facilities to the Railway department, in lieu of those
streets. You will see the portion of land there, between Lansdale and Little Bourke and Spencer streets;
that, I think, might be given over to the Railway department by the City of Melbourne Corporation, and
it could be a suitable station there for the conduct of suburban traffic.
1411. That would necessitate crossing Spencer-street?—Yes; but you observe there is a fall in that
street, and, I think, there might be a sub-way made under it.
1412. You say the city ought to give up that piece of ground?—I think, in lieu of the extension of
the streets, they should, and also to permit the Department, in case they should require it in future, to
tunnel under La Trobe-street, and to tunnel from the corner of Spring-street to the Royal park, if they
want a connection with the south portion of the railway system.
1413. This proposal completely lots out Mr John Coole's scheme of docks?—No; you will find, if
you closely observe, that Mr John Coole's docks are all there, and that they would be to the south and
westward of proposed site for goods and grain sheds, as shown by my sketch.
1414. No; it is all covered with railways here?—I judge from this map. [referring to a map].
1415. It is your intention to preserve Mr John Coole's docks?—Perhaps not exactly on the same
lines, but so that they would work in with the railway lines and sheds.
1416. Do you not know that tenders are already called for those docks?—No; there is nothing like
carefully considering all questions in connection with docks and railways and their relative positions before
acceptance.
1417. But, if it is a settled thing the docks shall be there, as recommended by Mr John Coole, would
it not affect your scheme?—I do not know that it would, because there is now immense space in the
West Melbourne swamp, and that ought all to be reserved for railway purposes, and docks.
1418. But there is a point fixed in that immense space for docks to be constructed?—Yes; but, I
think, the Railway department, and the Harbour Trust, and the city Corporation should all give and take
in carrying out great national works.
1419. Do you know if the city has laid that it could give up?—Yes; I presume it might—what
mentioned between Lansdale, Little Bourke, and Spencer streets.
1420. That is the market?—I do not know.
1421. It was once proposed to put up a frozen meat market there?—I did not know.
1422. How long is it since you brought this scheme before the notice of the public?—I spoke of it
some three or four years since, before Mr. Fehon's time, to Sir James MacPhail and Mr. Bronnell, and then I
gave to yourself (Mr. Cahn) and Mr. O'Grady tracings of my sketch some time ago.
1423. Are you aware that the scheme you propose practically does away with Flinders-street, which
is a level street, and substitutes for it Bourke-street, where there is a considerable rise?—If you look,
again, in the line of Spencer-street you will see that there is not such a considerable rise between the crown
of Collins-street and that of Flinders-street. I do not suppose that any greater difficulty would arise.
1424. But heavy traffic does not go that way. It goes along Flinders-street?—Yes; and it would
in the other case go to and from the docks direct by the other streets I propose extended.
1425. You break it with docks at the gasworks?—Yes, but I carry down the street; if you notice
[referring to sketch] Bourke-street is carried down along retaining wall to Dudley-street, goods sheds
and docks.
1426. Is Bourke-street fit for heavy traffic?—I should say it would be, if enlarged and grade reduced
when extended.
1427. Do you know what the level would be?—I am not exactly acquainted with that. I am not
an engineer by profession, and merely give my views. But I do not see any great difference in the level of
Collins-street and Flinders-street.
1428. This map is not drawn to scale?—No, it is simply a sketch from this map of Butten's. It
just gives an idea of my views.
1429. You have not caused any levels to be taken to prove whether it is feasible or not?—No, I am
not a professional man. I do not speak from that point of view. It is merely my view. Whether it can be
carried out or not is another question.
1430. If there are no difficulties in the way of levels, you consider this scheme is what should be
carried out?—I really think it is.
1431. Do you know any other gentleman connected with the Railway department now that enter-
tains similar views?—No, I do not. I may be isolated in that way, still I have looked at it carefully, while
the others have not considered my scheme.
1432. My object in asking is this, that all the railway officers who have given evidence here gave it
all in one direction?—I give it from a citizen's point of view, as I have been retired from the railways; but
I look after the railway interest too, for I consider that is the swamp there is any amount of field for the
extension of the railway. By that scheme I provide the sinewys of war, and, if they are provided, I fancy
there ought to be no engineering difficulties in the way. Of course, there may be heavy grades, but the
distance is so great between Spencer-street and the gasworks, it ought to go down very gradually, I imagine,
by retaining wall.
1433. A bugbear has been raised about the viaduct being in the way?—I would have no viaduct.
1434. You said just now that you did not think it necessary to connect Spencer-street with Flinders-
street?—Yes.
1435. Do you think, considering the large passenger traffic coming down from the north and going
to Gippsland, that it is a proper thing, or a wise thing, that they should shift all their luggage, and take a
train-car, and get out at Spencer-street, and get the whole of the luggage, and get into a tram-car, and get
out again at Flinders-street and re-book there; that is a wise thing to do. I ask that question in con-
sideration of the large amount of traffic now between the north part of the colony and Gippsland?—But
mind you, there is a large suburban traffic at those stations you mention. I think it would hamper less,
and there are such facilities by the tramways—
1436. Then the suburban traffic is to be considered entirely, and the country traffic is put out of the question altogether, from your point of view? — The country trains come in at longer intervals. The traffic is not so great as that of the suburban lines. Those trains with passengers, being much more numerous, should be considered, in point of danger especially.

1437. You will admit that there is a very large traffic, at any rate coming down from the north, going to Gippsland, and from Gippsland to the north? — I believe there is.

1438. As stationmaster, you, of course, know? — I should not know unless I was at the station and enquired and looked at the books, and all that.

1439. I have often met you at the station, and you must know that there is a large traffic? — I should imagine there is.

1440. Then the people that come from the north to Gippsland, and from Gippsland to the north are not to be considered, but those two stations are to be still disconnected? — But you know many of those persons travelling to Melbourne and beyond break their journey there.

1441. And a great many go through? — There may be.

1442. It is not desirable you say to connect it? — I do not think it is. It would be throwing away money. Look at London, and all those places that are connected by outer-circle railways; now that is done here by you.

1443. You are aware that it has been advocated for a long time to connect those railways, and it is to be done by this viaduct? — Yes, and it would be an eyecore to the city.

1444. If it is to be carried out, could it be done upon the level or by a viaduct? — I propose another means for a connection. At the corner of Flinders and Spring-streets the ground is very high — right under the Melbourne mail and how weak the goods and the south-west corner of the University and up to the Royal Park — a straight line of tunnels. There is a very low level in the Royal Park and it could be connected with the Coburg line. In that way you would have a connection if you like, beside the outer circle.

1445. You are aware that the present Commissioners contemplate connecting those two stations and an Act of Parliament is passed for it; now have you any idea how this street could be carried through, that is Collins-street, if those two stations are connected? Have you given that any consideration at all, whether by a level crossing or by a bridge over or by a sub-way, because it is important in getting evidence of this kind that we should have all possible views upon the matter? — I have not given that matter much consideration, but I should imagine that upon piers or tubes it ought to be carried over.

1446. The street carried over? — No, not the street, the connexion.

1447. Then how would you get the streets through? — Underneath, of course.

1448. A sub-way? — Yes.

1449. Then, have you considered in that case what the gradient would be coming up the sub-way from the wharves? — Am I to understand you are speaking of between Spencer-street and Flinders-street?

1450. No, I am speaking of the extension of Collins-street. — Down to the river?

1451. Down to the river; if those two stations are connected, as we have an Act of Parliament to do, is this street to cross the line by a level-crossing, or by a bridge, or by a sub-way? — According to that plan that could be either applied to Collins-street or Little Collins-street or other streets going under viaduct by sub-way or lowering level of ground sufficiently.

1452. Say Collins-street? — Yes; and by having the station not exactly in a line with Bourke-street, but further down than Bourke-street, you could have a way under, not a level crossing over, Collins-street.

1453. Is that level crossing a desirable thing in a main street? — I would say not by any means.

1454. Then how would you proceed? — I would not have it. I am opposed to that viaduct together.

1455. It is a settled question that those two stations are to be connected, and I want to get from you this — how would you cross the line connecting them? — I really cannot see a way of doing it, except by sub-way or reducing level of ground.

1456. And you would not recommend a level crossing at all in a main street like Collins-street? — Certainly I would not recommend a level crossing in Collins-street.

1457. Therefore you would not recommend a level crossing in Collins-street, how would you cross? — I would recommend Parliament to withdraw the authority to construct that viaduct.

1458. You are aware that there is a considerable amount of heavy traffic between the Gippsland station and this station? — I do not know that there is.

1459. You know a great many cattle come? — Yes.

1460. Would you propose to do away with the present system? — Decidedly.

1461. Then, how would you get your stock to market? — I would get them round by Oakleigh and Coburg.

1462. By the outer circle? — Yes. Here is a map showing it. [Producing and explaining the same].

1463. How much more of a round would be than coming straight through? — It would be a round, but it would be less obstructive to the city and suburban traffic.

1464. And more destructive to the cattle? — I do not think it would make much difference to them.

1465. You would transfer the rolling-stock also by that means? — Yes, by that means, or, in the future, by the tunnel I spoke of.

1466. You said that you recommend keeping the whole of the swamp for railway purposes? — Yes, and docks.

1467. And there is plenty of room there to carry over the sheds into the swamp? — Yes, I think so.

1468. Have you considered anything about the additional cost it would be to carry over the swamps, which is about half-a-mile further from the centre of the city, or more — the cost of carting heavy goods from there, instead of the present goods sheds? — Yes; I do not think it would make much difference.

1469. Would it not make some difference? — No doubt; but then you have the advantage against that, of disposing of all this land, and doing all your work, and building a new station, for nothing.

1470. But would that affect the country people who send down goods, if it costs them a shilling or two? — They do not care about the accommodation of the city of Melbourne; they want accommodation for themselves; and when they come down they are landed half-a-mile further from the city. It must cost so much more to cart their goods to the market; is
not that an objection?—So far it is; but you observe that this portion of the city will be devoted to ware-
houses and stores, so it will be nearer, perhaps, to the railway station.
1471. You admit that they must cart their goods to the city?—No doubt.
1472. And if it is further away it must cost more to cart?—Not much.
1473. You are a very old stationmaster of large experience in the Victorian railways; do not you think
that would be very unjust, and a great outcry would be raised in the country districts if they were put
another half-mile further outside the town—if the station was moved north of Bourke-street?—I do not look
at it in that way. I think these works are great national works, and the whole country is interested in them
—the extension of the city, the general question of placing the railway station where I propose and giving
them a fine station, with a good over their heads (which they have not at present), and facilities to
go to the docks, wharves, goods sheds, and city by trams; all would benefit by it.
1474. No doubt Melbourne is a very important place, but the whole of the colony does not think
that Melbourne is the colony. Are you aware that two-thirds of the passengers and goods traffic of the
colony comes into Spencer-street: that is in evidence here?—Of course, it is the London of Victoria.
1475. I wish an answer to that; is that your opinion?—I am not positively aware of that; I know
scarcely from observing, that is all.
1476. You have a great knowledge of railway traffic?—Yes, some.
1477. A very great portion of it comes here, at any rate?—Yes.
1478. If it is the case that two-thirds of the traffic comes into Spencer-street station from the
north, would it be just and fair that they should be put half-a-mile further from the city?—I think they
come to the centre of the city when the station is in the position it is proposed, and the trams can take
goods from the wharves straight to the country.
1479. You are looking a little ahead—a century hence, I presume?—I am taking an expansive sort
of view from the progress made and observed over thirty-four years and the consequent greater future
requirements.
1480. Not merely for to-day?—No; for the future as well. And, mind you, there is no chance to
extend the city, unless it is done now.
1481. Had you a scheme once to have a central station up at the old Supreme Court?—No;
that was Foster’s scheme, of Ballarat. I do not think the levels would suit up there. I had another idea,
and that was to have the station between Lonsdale-street and Bourke-street, but they said the space would
be insufficient to work the traffic, so I adopted this other scheme.
1482. By the extension of the city you simply mean the block from Bourke-street to Flinders-
street?—Yes.
1483. And from Spencer-street to the gasworks?—Yes, and westward to goods sheds and docks.
1484. You think the whole of the West Melbourne swamp should be handed over to the Railway
department?—Yes; that, and for docks.
1485. Have you any knowledge of the amount of plant and buildings that would be, to a certain
extent, destroyed by your proposition?—I believe that a good deal of the material could be utilised.
1486. To a great disadvantage?—I believe so; but I balance that with all the money that would
be obtained by the sale of this land, which would build railway yards, sheds, and station for nothing;
otherwise, if you have to build a new station, you must encroach upon the Railway funds. In this case you
get it out of the land sold there; and then, all the stores would be built upon land very convenient to the
wharves, docks, and railway sheds.
1487. Do you think the Railway department have any more land now than they require?—I think
they could spare that portion of it, and construct the sheds and docks; that is, if there are no engineering
difficulties in the way.
1488. If this scheme of yours really does away with Sir John Coode’s docks, would you still adhere
to it?—I would make Sir John Coode’s docks subservient to the interests of the community at large.
1489. Then, you still adhere to this scheme?—Unless there are any engineering difficulties that I am
not aware of. But Sir John Coode’s docks could work in with the two schemes.
1490. In carrying out your scheme, two great public works—first, Sir John Coode’s docks, and
secondly, the viaducts—would have to be abandoned?—Are not Sir John Coode’s docks upon that
sketch.
1492. As a matter of fact, they are obliterated by this sketch entirely?—I did not know that—
[the witness further inspected the plan].
1493. You see it does away with Sir John Coode’s docks?—Yes, I see it does now. But the
docks might be put somewhere else to work in with the lines and proposed goods sheds to greater advantage.
1494. Your curves are not put in to scale?—No; I think this scheme would interfere with them,
as far as that plan goes; but they could be altered and made to work together.
1495. This is your scheme of sheds coming down here?—Yes.
1496. That is how occupied by the docks?—Yes, so it appears.
1497. Your scheme would not be altered if the sheds were pushed further north?—Yes.
1498. It would take them so much further from the shipping?—Yes.
1499. Your scheme is mainly for passengers, and your station is north of Bourke-street and east of
the docks, do not come in till you reach the line of the gasworks?—Yes, and for goods, grain,
and wool sheds.
1500. The principal passenger station would be where?—At the angle of Spencer-street and
Bourke-street, with high clock tower at corner, and say a distance of twenty-two chains for offices, &c.,
along each street.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow, at Two o’clock.
FRIDAY, 15th APRIL, 1887.

Present:
N. Thornby, M.L.C., P. Wright, Esq., M.L.A.,
W. Madden, M.L.A., W. Cahn, Esq.,
W. A. Thomas, Esq., M.L.A., A. J. Shoupe, Esq.,
J. Laurens, Esq., M.L.A., C. Hodgkinson, Esq.,

Mr. M. Russell, M. Inst. C.E., examined.

1501. By the Commission.—Have you been long in the colony?—About twenty-seven years.
1502. In the colony?—Not in this colony; seventeen years in the colony of New South Wales, in the Public Works department.
1503. How long in Victoria?—I have been residing here about two years, on and off; I visited Victoria when I first came to the colonies.
1504. Upon what were you engaged in New South Wales?—Mainly railway engineering.
1505. The construction of lines of railway?—Designing and construction under Mr. Whitton, Engineer-in-Chief.
1506. Can you mention any important line with which you were connected?—I was with Mr. Whitton in the head office; consequently all lines I had to do with, more or less.
1507. During your stay in New South Wales was there at any time a proposition to alter the principal station at Sydney?—Yes, many schemes.
1508. In what direction did those schemes tend, as a rule?—In every direction, wherever political influence led them.
1509. Did those schemes tend to bring the stations closer to the centres of population, or to shift them further away?—There were so many that I could hardly generalize. My own scheme was to make the projected terminus of the railways very near its present position at Redfern. This scheme, I may say, largely met with Mr. Whitton’s approval; had it rested with the department it would have been adopted; when this time came before Parliament, as was the fate of many other schemes, Parliamentary influence caused it to be shelved.
1510. How far would you say Redfern is from the heart of the capital?—I take it that Redfern is really the heart of Sydney now, because it is growing all round it. The scheme to which I refer now had for its object the connection of the Circular Quay and all the shipping of Sydney with the railway system.
1511. Then it was a somewhat analogous scheme to our present dock scheme?—Certainly, only in Sydney we are not, as you are, divided; that is to say, our railway system comes to a focus there, here your systems are separated.
1512. Have you had an opportunity since you have been in Melbourne of visiting the swamp?—I have had an opportunity, and being an engineer, I claim to be able to take it more, perhaps, at a mere bird’s eye view, or inspection of that kind, than I should be warranted in assuming if I were not one. Of course, however, I have not had the advantage of any levees, sections, or plans now in existence to guide me in any opinion I may have formed, simply my own personal observation. I have made one or two inspections.
1513. Have you visited the Fenders-street proposed method of access to the docks?—Yes, I have.
1514. Is it proposed to widen that street very considerably all along the river bank?—Yes, I understand so.
1515. From what you have seen do you think that that mode of access is insufficient?—I should not like to say that; I do not like to criticize any other professional man’s proposals in the absence of proper information. I should be happy to answer any direct question, but it would not do to generalize. I should like to see the plans first.—[The same were exhibited to the witness.] I could not object to that proposed extension, because it makes a portion of the plan that I propose to lay before you, with your permission.
1516. The proposal of Fenders-street?—Yes, and other proposals.
1517. Have you a sketch showing your plans?—I have plans here, prepared by myself.
1518. What do these plans disclose?—I should like to read a few lines which I have brought with me here, not then knowing whether I should be able to attend here personally or not.—[The witness reads as follows]:—

EXTENSION OF CITY WESTWARDS—DOCK SYSTEM, &c.

To the Royal Commissioners of Enquiry, Melbourne.

Gentlemen,—I am about September last my attention was first directed to the question then being discussed in the Argus on the above important subjects, and as a railway and civil engineer of many years’ experience I was tempted into thinking out and putting into form a few ideas which I held as to a comprehensive and at the same time practicable plan by which the extension of the city westwards, a dock system, &c., might be best realized.

Having retired from the Public Service a year or two since (and not contemplating assuming professional work), I have been reluctant to bring forward the plans I refer to lest it might appear that I was interring upon the domain of the engineers, with whom, so far, the consideration of these proposed important public works has been placed.

Noticing, however, that the Harbour Trust, on the one hand, and the Royal Commission on the other, are now engaged upon the respective questions of dock accommodation and city extension, I beg to invite your attention to the following ‘synopsis’ of my suggestions, which are not fully, and I think, sufficiently clearly expressed by the drawings accompanying them, and which I shall be glad to place before the Royal Commissioners and Harbour Trust for inspection.

It will be apparent, from a perusal of this synopsis, that I do not seek to divert from Sir J. Coates and Mr. Brady one tithe of the credit which is due to them as the respective originators of the proposed site for the dock at the Melbourne swamp, but, that in my opinion, Mr. Brady’s views as to the adoption of timber construction are safe and practicable.

But before the work of dock construction is actually commenced, upon the very much modified and reduced plan now proposed by Mr. Brady, I would earnestly suggest its re-considération, and upon these important grounds especially:—Firstly. The dimensions of the dock, or basins, proposed are too small for anything but an expedient for the temporary relief and accommodation of the shipping requirements of this port.

Secondly. The dock constructed where shown in the plans, it will encroach and destroy one of the most important portions of the building site which should be reserved as and surrounding the large dock which must at some time be made hereafter.

I am, Gentlemen, yours, &c.,

M. Russell, M. Inst. C.E.

Melbourne, 15th April 1887.

That letter was first written, I may explain, with the intention of asking its insertion in the columns of the Argus newspaper. At the time that it sent it, the editor was kind enough to inform me that he was inundated by applications of a similar character from various gentlemen, some professional and others, so
that he thought it better, as there was a Royal Commission now sitting, that I should ask to be allowed to submit any suggestions or ideas I had upon the subject to you. I did not expect to be called so quickly before you, otherwise I should have re-written it, so as to be more directly applicable to your Commission.

You see I include the dock question together with the question of city extension; I think the two things are intimately connected. In my synopsis I have given my reasons for connecting these two matters, and showing why they should be connected, looking forward to Melbourne as it may be, or will be, we hope, in fifty year's time, rather than as it is to-day.

1519. Then, you dissent from the present scheme of dock construction? — No; I am entirely with Mr. Brady as to the practicability of constructing a satisfactory dock with timber. Where I differ is simply in this, that Mr. Brady proposes to occupy one of the most important portions, as I take it, of the site suitable and required for building purposes, and his plan does not occupy the best portion of the site for dock purposes.

1520. Then, you differ both from Mr. Brady and Sir John Coode? — No; on the contrary, I desire to express my agreement with them in many respects.

1521. Then, you object, not to the method of construction of the dock, but simply to the site?— I will not go so far as to say I object, but I differ from Sir John Coode's proposal, as to the form of construction, and I think Mr. Brady's proposal is certainly the best under the circumstances, and perfectly practicable.

1522. As to the site of the dock, do you differ from him?— I do, as to the last site adopted; for I take it that, if the dock is built in that place, it would occupy, and for all time, a portion of the site that should be reserved for building purposes.

1523. Do you produce any plans, showing the alternative site you suggest?—Yes, I have them all here.

1524. Will you describe about the position where you would make a dock?—Yes. — [The witness produced and explained a plan.]

1525. Had you any levels at all to guide you in preparing this plan? — Nothing but what I took with my eye.

1526. You produce three plans? — Yes.

1527. Show a modification in the area and position of those docks proposed? — Yes, two of the plans show this.

1528. Showing an extension of Collins-street, with a view of the Railway department giving up all its land between the extension of Flinders-street? — Not: the whole of the land, a portion of it—the largest portion of it.

1529. All except the portion required for the viaduct? — Yes, and a little more than that, for railway yard and accommodation purposes.

1530. You do not, apparently, approve of extending Bourke-street? — No; that would be an unwise thing, I think, to attempt.

1531. Nor any street, except Flinders, Collins, and La Trobe streets? — No.

1532. The widening of Flinders-street, the extension of Collins-street west, and the extension of La Trobe-street? — Yes.

1533. And you provide in your plan two systems, one a low-level system, and the other a high-level system? — A low and high-level system combined.

1534. The high-level system crossing Collins-street at a certain height? — Yes.

1535. You do not know how high it would be necessary to go? — I should provide, certainly, not less than 15 feet.

1536. I believe 16 feet is in the Act for the main roads? — Sixteen feet is ample, but 15 feet I can give.

1537. Your plan shows about 18 feet? — Yes.

1538. Then you thoroughly approve of connecting the two stations? — Certainly, I think that is very desirable; I fancy Mr. Speight would thoroughly endorse that.

1539. If the stations cannot be connected at the same time that you extend Collins-street, which of the two would you choose as an alternative—either the loss of the viaduct, or the extension of the street? —I cannot conceive of the impossibility of connecting them at all.

1540. But you say you have taken no levels at all? — No; but provided I am permitted to work out my own scheme—and not that somebody else does so—I will guarantee to work it out to my idea, and prove the practicability of it.

1541. In regard to the docks, the whole of your plan is subservient to a certain change in the dock site? — No.

1542. Your plans are all governed by the change of site of the docks?—My dock plans were intended to show the adoption of Mr. Brady's or Sir John Coode's site—which gentleman claims the merit of selecting the site I do not know; but whilst adopting that site, I proposed to change the form of dock, and not to use a different form of construction of dock; but I should explain that I prepared that plan in October last, and at that time I had not heard anything of Mr. Brady's last scheme, which, I believe, has been adopted; and I believe the information in my hands goes to show that that would occupy a portion of ground which would be much better kept for building purposes; any dock should go further into the swamp.

1543. Does the Harbour Trust know of the existence of these plans? — No, nobody has seen them but yourselves.

1544. Then if the Trust has already decided upon the question of the site of the dock—is I am aware that I am a little late. You would see in the letter I read just now I did not know that the matter was still further being discussed by the Harbour Trust, or I might have sought to bring forward the plans sooner, but my first information was from reading in the Argus one morning lately that it was decided to adopt Mr. Brady's modification of Sir John Coode's system, which I cannot see to be much of a modification.

1545. You provide four or five separate docks or basins?—These are only other suitable dock sites.

1546. Available? — Available, or which should be reserved for the purpose.

1547. Does the site you suggest, or any portion of it, for buildings, take any of the area vested in the Trust? — As far as I understand by the plans published in the Argus newspaper—I had no other data.
before me, but those. I have, in preparing my plans, kept strictly to the lines shown upon those *Argus* plans, therefore I imagine it is so.

1548. Upon the plan all the bluffs are vested in the Trust?—Yes.

1549. You show in your plan a large area of land salable, lying between your dock and the river?—Yes.

1550. That is not shown upon the Harbour Trust plan at all?—Of course you would not have it in the same outline of form at all, but it comes within the same area.

1551. You find the dock back so as to have a certain part of land available for sale between the dock and the river?—Certainly. Upon your plan, which I am told is Mr. Brady's new plan, a portion of the site is proposed to be used for a dock that I think should be reserved for building.

1552. Your plan shows the extension of Collins-street west, not in a straight line?—Yes, so far as practicable, till you get to the gas-works.

1553. Do you think, then, that it would be wise on the part of the Railway department to part with the land between Collins-street and Flanders-street?—I think that, so far as the data in my possession at present influence my opinion, it would be so; for I think we could receive ourselves largely from the sale of that for the necessary great expense of carrying out any alteration in the railway system here.

1554. Looking upon the enormous strides that our railway system must make within the next ten, twenty, or fifty years, would it be wise for the department to hand over for any money this piece of land?—It is not so very large a piece that I propose to part with.

1555. How many acres?—I suppose about eight acres.

1556. Is it not more than that?—*[The witness inspected and further explained the plan.]*

1557. The area is 36 acres, but you do not propose to sell all that?—No, about 20 acres I think.

1558. You were not aware that the railway and extended down to the gas-works on the eastern side?—Just what I have indicated in plan.

1559. Seeing that the dock question is settled, as far as the Harbour Trust is concerned, how far could your plan be modified, accepting that as the position of things at present, and still carry the extension of Collins-street, could it be done?—Mr. Brady's last proposal would have to be abandoned if mine were adopted, so far as the dock is concerned.

1560. Could Collins-street be extended according to your plan if the Harbour Trust persist in constructing their docks as at present?—Certainly, it is not contingent upon that at all.

1561. What you propose, in reference to the railway station and the extension of Collins-street, could be carried out without any reference to the docks?—Certainly.

1562. The object of the extension of Collins-street then, with you, would be simply to sell the land?—To open up access to the dock system.

1563. Do you know what the gradient is?—1 in 20?—Yes; not very formidable even so.

1564. Do you think it is likely persons would travel upon that gradient when they could come up on Flanders-street which is a level?—Unless I had the gradients before me, and the plans, I would not say; it is possible.

1565. It is possible, but is it probable that people would travel upon a gradient of 1 in 20 when they could have a level?—But is it not possible to get a better gradient than 1 in 20.

1566. The engineers have taken the levels?—But the land sold could be raised indefinitely.

1567. The two points are fixed—one, the level of Collins-street, and the other end the docks?—But you can be raising the dock site all the time.

1568. That is another alteration of the dock?—Certainly not, the ground surrounding the dock, and which becomes your building site; in fact which you are going to sell.

1569. But you cannot lift the wharves of your dock beyond a certain point?—Certainly not; but what is that point?

1570. The grade down to the lower level will be governed by the distance you have to traverse?—Certainly.

1571. Are you aware that at a certain period of the year here, within a space of three hours, about 40,000 people have to be conveyed by rail to the racecourse?—Yes.

1572. How would your arrival passenger station suit such a traffic as that?—I should hope it would suit it remarkably well; I should think myself a very indifferent engineer if I could not provide for that.

1573. Would you have any objection to leave the plans in the hands of the Commission?—If you think them worthy of your attention I shall leave them with very great pleasure.

1574. And the explanation of them?—Yes, with pleasure.

1575. If you will hand them to the shorthand writer they will be inserted in the Appendix to the evidence?—Yes,—*[Post Appendix.]* I may say that I do not hope for an instant to have established any hard and fast lines for either your thoughts or mine to travel in upon this matter; but I do hope I have thrown a new suggestion before you, and with ample time at my command, such as the officers of the service have, and with all the information before them it might be worked out to a successful result, I should like to nothing better as an engineer, than to work it out myself. My own occupation is now of necessity something quite different, and I am not engineering now; but at the same time I have very great interest and pleasure in all that concerns Melbourne and its future, and I should feel particular satisfaction in seeing this scheme worked out, if not by myself, by somebody. I venture to say, as an engineer, that it is perfectly practicable.

1576. Have you seen any plans by the Railway department showing the proposed new station to face the extension of Collins-street?—No, I have seen nothing whatever, except what has appeared in the *Argus*.

1577. At any rate, your station would block Bourke-street for all time?—Certainly.

1578. And every street—La Trobe street?—No. The three streets—Flanders, Collins, and La Trobe streets—would be opened under my proposal.

1579. If the Railway department carry out this proposal of building its station upon the alignment of Collins-street, extended at any time, Bourke-street, or any of the other streets could be opened up, provided the Railway department did not encumber the ground with building?—Do I understand that the Railway department propose that?
1580. The Railway department propose that the railway station shall not face Spencer-street, but shall face south to Collins-street upon its north side, and that the ground you propose to sell shall be occupied with goods sheds and other accommodation?—It seems to me that the main difference between us then is, that they do not propose to connect their two systems, and I do.

1581. But they do propose it, and there is an Act of Parliament passed already for a viaduct to join the two systems?—I am completely in the dark upon all those things.

1582. You propose to bring all the lines together at the proposed bridge at La Trobe-street?—Not all the lines. The two systems would be together there; they must be together at some general crossing. — [The witness further explained his meaning upon the plan.]

1583. You bring the traffic all into a bottle-neck, which we have been trying to do away with in two or three places already here?—But if you connect the systems you must have a bottle-neck somewhere.

1584. The evidence we have received from the Commissioners of Railways all points to their belief that in a few years time the station accommodation will be too small in area, and then it will be necessary either to purchase property or to go farther back into the swampy and further plan would prevent that, for it contemplates selling the land—the land which the Railway department would have to expand upon, as it were, and take in for future operations, according to your plan would be alienated from the Crown?—But, on the other hand, I fail to understand why neither the Railway Commissioners nor the engineers have suggested a high and low level, or combination scheme. By that means I so very largely increase the working powers of the lines that I more than compensate for any loss of land which I have suggested to be given up, but some of which, upon further consideration, I might suggest not to be given up.

1585. Your high level is only an extension and widening of the viaduct?—Not only that, but it nearly duplicates your accommodation in the yard, as far as running is concerned.

1586. You propose to go further back, and split the traffic at a certain point to the higher or the lower level, as you like?—I go higher up. In London, as you are aware, they go lower down as well as higher up. What I propose you have an intimate knowledge and that would be only a small matter of engineering at home.

1587. Did you go into the question of cost at all?—I venture to approach it only very feitfully indeed. I should not like to say anything definite about cost.

1588. About what length of high-level road would you have?—That would have to depend entirely upon the existing gradients, and how far they could be adapted to my proposals or my proposals to them.

1589. With your high-level line would you propose to carry goods at all?—Not more than could be avoided. I look upon it as a passenger system chiefly.

1590. It might be adapted to the Gippsland traffic, that has to go to the sale-yards?—Certainly; that would be a very important element in it. That is where I think, one of the many advantages of the high-level system would come in, upon the connection.

1591. Upon your longitudinal section here you show two lines of rails, one above the other?— [The witness inspected and explained the section alluded to.]

The witness withdrew.

Robert Gray Ford examined.

1629. By the Commission.—You were connected with the Railway department for a long time?—Yes.

1585. As Engineer of Construction?—Yes.

1594. How many years were you at work?—About twenty-four years.

1595. Of course you have an intimate knowledge then of all the lines?—Yes, I had at the time I left.

1596. Have you followed the evidence given by the railway authorities and others upon this proposal?—No, I have not.

1597. You are aware that it is proposed to excise a portion of the land at present occupied by the Railway department, and to sell that land, or dispose of it, so that it shall not be used by the Railway department, and put the station further back than it is at the present time. Have you heard of that proposition?—Yes.

1598. One proposition is that it shall be removed to Bourke-street, and another that it shall remain to face Collins-street?—Yes.

1599. What is your opinion as to the advisability of disposing of any of the railway land?—I think it would be a very bad policy indeed to sell any of it.

1600. The piece of land that the department is asked to consent to the sale of is that lying between Collins-street and Flinders-street, running down nearly as far as the gas-works. What is your opinion as to the sale of that particular piece?—I think it would be very unwise. I may say that I made out a design for a station, I think in 1876. There was a Commission then sitting, and they considered it ought to be moved up to the gaol reserve; there was another proposition to take it to Carlton gardens, and then a third one to take it down opposite St. Francis' Church, is Elizabeth-street, and a fourth to make Flinders-street a central station; and I was asked then to make out a plan to see what could be done with Spencer-street. I may say that we never had a plan of Spencer-street up to that date. I had a survey made of the yard, and a model made to show the condition at that time, and I tried to alter the station yard to make it come in, but I was obliged to ignore the whole thing and make another plan. That plan showed the passenger station terminating at the end of Bourke-street, and is what they call an end-on station, and part of the goods shed lines were altered the same as they are now carried out. I carried out the greater part of it—taking up the lines and relaying them. After the Government purchased the Holstein's Bay lines, it was considered necessary to modify Spencer-street station a little, and I made a second plan, modifying it, showing a viaduct connecting Flinders-street with Spencer-street station, with four lines of way. The proposition I then had in view was to run the Essendon trains through to Hawthorn, and the Brighton trains to Williamstown, turning the Flinders-street and Spencer-street stations into through stations for passenger
trafficking that is, purely suburban; it would save a great deal of shunting and rolling stock. To give you an idea of the difference between a terminal and a through station you have only to compare Richmond with Flinders-street. I proposed to have four lines of way along the viaduct, two for goods and two for passengers.

1601. That is the viaduct between Flinders-street and Spencer-street?—Yes, and upon the same plan were shown three goods sheds, to be built where the traffic required them, and four passenger platforms. Do you consider that one of twenty-four trains, that is, twenty-four trains could stand there when necessary. The three goods sheds were each a thousand feet long, and upon a low and a high level, that is, the trains could come underneath the goods sheds and take away goods at the same time they were taking away at the upper level. The difficulty in the goods department here now is to get the goods away from the platforms, not to get the quantity of goods into the sheds. By my plan the accommodation was doubled as far as the road traffic was concerned.

1602. You made four plans altogether?—Yes, I made four.

1603. And you had to abandon one after the other?—No, only abandoned one—the first one I made.

1604. You made one showing the passenger station at Bourke-street?—Yes.

1605. What became of that one?—It is in the Department now.

1606. Did you give up that idea?—Yes, when the Hobson's Bay lines were bought.

1607. That altered the case; it was a now factor in the question?—Yes. There was a connexion shown upon the first plan.

1608. You are aware where the station is proposed to be built now?—No; I only know what I made out myself.

1609. The station is proposed to be built facing the extension of Collins-street?—Yes. Excuse me a minute—[producing a plan]—this is the general plan of the two stations that I made out. [The witness hands over the plan.] My idea of a station is that it ought never to be finished; that it ought to be capable of continual extension as the railways require it.

1610. Therefore, your views are, that there should be no modification of the present boundaries of the Railway reserve?—Not any.

1611. In all the plans you drew you did not contemplate selling any land at all?—No.

1612. Between the corner of Bourke-street and Spencer-street, and Flinders-street, none at all?—No.

1613. But even that station was modified afterwards, by the purchase of the Hobson's Bay lines?—Yes; because I thought we might run the Brighton trains to Williamstown, and the Hawthorn trains to Essendon.

1614. From your evidence I gather that you think the viaduct a vital necessity to the railway system?—Yes; it is costly to have the lines separated, because you may have a very heavy traffic on one side and very light on the other, and, if there is a connexion, you can exchange rolling-stock without any trouble.

1615. You have a certain knowledge of goods traffic?—Yes.

1616. Which street do you think affords the best access to the new dock?—I think Flinders-street.

1617. Do you think widening that street would be sufficient?—Yes; it might be made nearly three chains wide. You could fill up part of the old dock at the bottom of Spencer-street, and take away Raleigh's buildings and the stores, and straighten Flinders-street (there would be a loss of part of the goods land). To carry the three chains still further on, you would require to take off the corner of the gas-works. In my small plan you will see that the gas-works interfere very seriously with the extension of Flinders-street. Then, Dudley-street is shown there, coming on to the level of the dock.

1618. Do you consider that one of the main approaches, then, to it?—Yes, I think, on the north side, that would be the best opening you could have.

1619. What about La Trobe-street extending it to the dock?—Goods traffic will never go up La Trobe-street; the grade is too high. Beside that, you see that the railways go all round the docks and the wharves.

1620. There is no difficulty, as far as the railway is concerned, in extending La Trobe-street?—It is a very serious matter interfering with the large railway station like this, where you cannot possibly define its limits; perhaps you may put in something to-day that you require to move ten years hence. It interferes very seriously with the roads, and the roads are the first consideration in a railway yard, especially shunting. I will give you an instance—When first I had charge of this yard, we had four engines shunting; then, we were working with the Williamstown and Essendon lines and the up-country trains, and every train had to be pulled out backwards and pushed in. I suggested an alteration, and Mr. Anderson accepted it, and it cost a little under £10,000; in the first year (you will see in the report), it saved over £2,000 in the working expenses. We got rid of four engines and 27 sets of points and crossings, by simply lengthening the platforms, and allowing the engines to get round their own trains. You will see my plan there shows the engines can get outside as soon as ever they come in with their trains.

1621. Then you think that the road along the river, the extension of Flinders-street, would be a sufficient means of access to the Crown lands lying beyond the docks?—Yes, and Dudley-street must be extended as well.

1622. What do you think of the proposal to extend either Collins-street or Bourke-street by bridging?—I think it would be a very serious mistake as far as my experience goes.

1623. The lines would pass underneath?—The lines to-day may, but we do not know what may be required ten or fifteen years hence.

1624. Would you recommend carrying over La Trobe-street?—No, I would not. I consider a terminus like this ought to be kept as clear as possible. It is very expensive to put anything new down.

1625. Your idea, then, is that Flinders-street and Dudley-street will be sufficient to carry all the traffic from the docks?—Yes. You see the mills are all laid round the docks.

1626. Does the system of docks shown upon that blue portion meet with your approval?—I do not know. I made that plan two years before Sir John Cooke came out here, those docks shown there and the cut.

1627. This provides for a very much more extensive dock?—Not more so than those I showed.
1628. The black represents yours here?—No, the blue is Sir John Coole's. That was printed two
years after.

1629. Your dock is what is sometimes called Woods's dock, is it not?—Yes, I will explain. We
arranged to take 1,000,000 tons of silt from the Harbour Trust to raise the yards to get the goods ships
extended, and the Traffic department was pressing me very hard to raise it and get the lines down.
I found it was costing us 13½ d. a yard for silt as it was taken out of the pontoons, and it did not make a
yard of solid earth. Besides that, I could not get the lines down upon it; it would not set, and I suggested
to Mr. Watson to let me take some stuff out of the swamp. I had a trial shoot put down 40 feet and
another 60, and the first I put down filled with water. I went down and had it bailed out. I saw a
layer of sand about two feet from the surface, eight inches thick. I pulled the top; the shaft remained
dry for a month. Then I had another put down 60 feet, and I asked permission to take the stuff out of
the swamp instead of taking it from the Harbour Trust. We had not the land reserved then; the land
was reserved and Mr. Watson consented, provided the Commissioner would agree to it. Mr. Woods and Mr.
Watson went down to decide upon this matter, and he asked me how much I wanted, and I said three-
quarters of a million yards. He said there was 8½" to be a very large hold. He said, "Could you make it come in for a deck or something less?" and I said, "Yes, perhaps it might
be done." Then I got that plan of Melbourne and suburbs and put that new cut on as you see it there in
1877. That is what led to its being called Woods's dock; and, after the ground was reserved I commenced
and took out 740,000 yards of stuff; that cost 9½d. per yard, or a little under that.

1630. And you were paying a larger price for other stuff for shipping a lot of water?—We were pay-
ing 13½d.; and we could not get the lines down.

1631. Solid measurement, or excavation?—Solid measurement.

1632. Does the dock proposed by Sir John Coode cover the same land?—Pretty nearly. You have
the one printed over the other there. Mr. Brady put it upon the plan.

1633. How would you provide access to the land coloured yellow?—I have not seen that plan.

1634. That is the extension of the swamp?—Yes;

1635. Yes; Crowns land—[The witness inspected the plan]?—There is a road all the way down the
sides to the Saltwater River; that is one outlet. Then, you can run Flinders-street the whole way down
to the Saltwater River again, along the banks of the River Yarra, three chains wide. Then, you can run
down Dudley-street at right angles nearly; you can get under the Williamstown line as often as you
please; it is all bank beyond the hill.

1636. You know there is a large bridge at North Melbourne, that would come in for access?—The
old bridge?

1637. No; the new bridge?—An over bridge?

1638. Yes?—I think that was a terrible mistake to put that there.

1639. From what you know of the nature of the swamp, in the portion indicated upon the plan, do
you think it at all suitable for the extension of the city of Melbourne for building purposes?—Yes, you
can build upon it. We took that stuff out of the dock; I could not use horses. They used to go down
to their belli; we double-sleeped the lines, and I never had an engine or a waggon off.

1640. This portion, indicated by yellow upon the plan, is a good deal westward of the portion you
operated upon?—Yes; but I think it is all the same stuff.

1641. Are you not aware that there has been great subsidence in the railway line there?—Yes;
upon the Saltwater River.

1642. Are you not aware also that one of the sheds, put up by the Harbour Trust, which was upon
35 feet piles, the platform sank very considerably, when it was weighted with some bags of sugar; and
would not that fact seem to indicate that the erection of buildings upon the yellow area would be very
expensive in regard to foundations?—I do not think so, as far as my experience goes. The yard was raised
upon the same material, and it never settled an inch, although I allowed for subsidence. That is the best
stuff I ever used for making a bank—out of the swamp.

1643. But how did the settlement take place in the Harbour Trust land?—I only give my experi-
ence; I cannot explain what they did; I know what I did.

1644. We all know, of course, that nothing is impossible in engineering. We can get foundations
anywhere, but it is a question of expense. Would it be desirable to encourage building in Melbourne where
foundations must, necessarily, be expensive?—I do not think it would be expensive. In Wright and
Edwards' foundry, near Rolleston Brothers, the ground is billy worse than I had to deal with in the dock;
and I am quite certain the swamp land is the same right down to the Saltwater River.

1645. Are you aware that there is some settlement in the buildings erected upon the driest part of
the swamp near Footscray, though they were erected upon platforms?—I am not aware of it. I know
that all of I built did not subside.

1646. Are you not aware that there has been some terrible failure in the foundations by the gas-
works?—No. I know we had some of the heaviest engines upon the work I did. Though it would not
carry a horse, it would carry a locomotive on the embankment. You will see the goods sheds over the
yard; that is all filled up with stuff out of the dock.

1647. Are you aware that all the embankments upon the line to Coburg sank very considerably in
the formation of it?—No. That was not made when I was in the department.

1648. At any rate that is the fact; and that being a fact would it not also imply that there must be
necessarily some extra expense in putting large buildings upon such a swamp as that in the portion
coloured yellow?—Yes. It is simply a question of surface. You must make provision for it.

1649. Therefore building in this area would be more expensive than in other parts round the city of
Melbourne. Certainly it would. But my experience is this, that we had engines from 35 to 54 tons, and
the bearing was nine feet wide, double sleeped, whereas a horse could not travel at all. It is simply a
question of surface.

1650. Do you think it desirable that anything should be done to encourage the extension of Mel-
bourne upon this ground when, upon the west side of the new cut, there is good sound ground that would
permit of the extension of Melbourne to Sandridge?—Yes, I do think building should be encouraged there,
because I know while it will be built upon. I remember when Sandridge was first sold, people would
not look at it for building. They said it was all sand and they could not build upon it.
1650. Then you are quite clear that the proper access to the land coloured yellow is by Flinders-street widened and carried on?—Right down to the Saltwater River, and carry it the whole distance three
chains wide.
1651. How would you cross the entrance to the dock?—Have a caisson.
1652. You would provide that also by having great width?—You see upon the small plan a swing
bridge marked over the Yarra and the railway going over the swing bridge.
1653. In fact that shows roughly in the sketch your proposal with the exception of La Trobe-street
[handing a plan to the witness]—Yes. I think it would be very unwise to take anything over the
station yard, for as I say what you do to-day may come in the road some years hence, and it is a very serious
matter to interfere with the lines.
1654. And you think that access provided by the lines shown there, namely, Flinders-street, Dudley-
street, and North Melbourne, will be ample for all purposes in that direction, the city being extended?—I
beg pardon, Dudley and Flinders streets.
1655. Dudley-street, Flinders-street, and North Melbourne?—Yes. Dudley-street and Flinders-
street. All the north and south streets come on to Flinders-street down here; there is no difficulty about
it. Then south, there are only two outlets, Princes bridge and the Falls bridge. The whole of the
traffic has to be carried by those two outlets north and south on the other side, and all the exchange traffic
from the wharf. There is, of course, a great deal of that comes across the Falls bridge, north to south and
south to north, and that is purely local; nothing to do with the traffic between Sandridge, Banyule, Mount
Hill, and Melbourne, and the whole of the streets abutting on Flinders-street on the north side; all traffic
has to cross over those two bridges.
1656. This your view is this, that if Princes bridge and the Falls bridge are capable of taking all
the traffic between the north and south sides of the river, then, in your opinion, Flinders-street is capable of
taking all the traffic to the West Melbourne swamp?—Yes.
1657. Even for the future?—Yes.
1658. And then, I suppose, you mention the fact that for many years past an enormous traffic has been
carried on over Princes bridge and the Falls bridge; bridges very much narrower than those proposed to be
put there?—Yes, very much narrower. And I say Princes bridge ought to have been 360 feet wide, and
as ought the Falls bridge, because you cannot build bridges below. There is always a point at which you
must stop. In London there is a London bridge. It does not matter what the traffic is, at some point you
must stop, and I think it is the Falls bridge in Melbourne, and, therefore, you should have as large a bridge
there as you can possibly get.
1659. What is the width of the new Falls bridge?—Ninety-nine feet; the difference between the
two is this, there is no local traffic over the Princes bridge; there is a very large local traffic over the
Falls bridge from north to south and south to north.

The witness withdrawn.
Adjourned to Thursday the 28th instant, at Two o'clock.
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1660. By the Commissioner.—You were Commissioner of Railways during what period?—1876 a
little while, 1877, 1878, 1879, and part of 1880.
1661. During your time of office you took a very great interest in improving the station yard, and
various adajiences of the railway traffic here?—Yes.
1662. The yard was very considerably increased, I believe, during your time?—When I came here
the station was not worthy of the name of a passenger station. It was full of holes and curves, and
ramshackle old buildings that the roads had to be trained round, and accidents, as they called them, were
constantly taking place in the yard that were no accidents, of course.
1663. A large amount of land was reclaimed from the swamp for station purposes?—Yes, but not a
very large amount; not as such as ought to have been reclaimed, in my opinion.
1664. A very great increase in the land was required?—Yes, I got 213 acres permanently reserved,
which was handed over to the Harbour Trust afterwards by Act of Parliament, to my great regret.
1665. You have heard of the proposal to extend various streets of Melbourne across the present
station site?—I have heard some indefinite kind of proposals that way.
1666. It is proposed to extend various streets that shut upon Spencer-street, and to dispose of the
land fronting upon those streets. From your experience as a Minister having charge of the department
during those years, do you think it would be wise for the Government to consent to part with any of this
land?—Certainly not. I approved of a plan partly suggested by myself, and partly by others, but I approved
of a single plan for the re-casting of the station upon different lines altogether, namely, straight lines instead
of curved ones.
1567. Would the adoption of that plan allow some of the land to be made available for building purposes?—No.

1568. You still retain possession of all the land?—Certainly. I take the models that I had constructed at the time as showing the design. I do not know where they are now.

1569. You think no re-arrangement of the station ground could be brought about whereby such a street as Collins-street could be produced, and all the land south of it be sold?—Certainly not, in my opinion.

1570. Then I gather that your policy would be to extend the station ground instead of curtailing it?—Yes. I made a proposition at the time to purchase the land owned by Mr. Williams, with his waggon shop down there. I wanted to include that in the station yard, and go right up to the gasworks, and it is a great pity it was not done.

1571. You are aware that a large area of this land is simply used for storing timber?—Yes. Might not that timber be stored elsewhere, and the ground thrown open to other uses?—No, I do not think so. I do not see where you could store it. Beside, it is the proper place for a terminus.

1572. Do you call storing timber a strictly railway business?—Yes. They bring the timber upon the line and store it here, in the same way that a steamier brings its coal to the port and stores it in the yard.

1573. What is your opinion upon the question of a passenger station? You have heard, I dare say, of a proposal to centralize the passenger traffic at Elizabeth-street?—What would be a central passenger station? A station central to one part of Melbourne is not central to other parts.

1574. Do you then approve of keeping the suburban station apart from the up-country terminals?—Yes. There might possibly be an arrangement when the viaduct is carried out of running the suburban trains through the suburban stations, and making both Spencer-street and Flinders-street calling stations; or you may call them road-side stations, if you like; that is to say, run your suburban trains through and through. In fact, a proposition of that sort was entertained at the time that I was Commissioner of Railways, and it is one that would very likely have been carried out eventually, supposing the other works had been carried out; so that you do not have to break up your trains. One of the reasons, I may say, for that is this—Land or station room at Flinders-street is very limited, it is merely a narrow strip, and if you could get over the breaking-up of trains at that station without preserving with the traffic, it would be a great deal better. In other words, supposing, for instance, you were to start a train at Brighton, and run on, it may be, to Williamstown, or Essendon, or wherever it goes to, as a through train, instead of having to break your train up at Flinders-street, where you are very limited indeed for room, you would run your engines clean through, simply take in water or coal.

1575. That is, of course, merely a matter of railway arrangement?—Yes.

1576. No matter how far you perfect them, still you could not give up any of the station land?—No, you want it all.

1577. The inquiry is whether any land could be given up for the extension of Melbourne to the westward, and for access to the docks?—I do not know of any. I remember, at the time when I was Commissioner, the corporation, I think, wanted a piece of the land to the north here for widening Flinders-street, and I declined to let them have it; I thought Flinders-street did want widening, but I thought they had land enough of their own to widen it with without coming near the railway land at all. There is a lot of land there between the present north side of Flinders-street and the wharves that is not put to any very good purpose. For instance, they have stuck a bit of a Harbour Trust building upon it, for one thing; they have put a drill shed on, and there is a lot of old rubbish lying in places that might be properly converted into the width of the street, a good flat street. As far as talking about access to the docks is concerned, suppose you could get road either across or under the railway (I am not aware of there being any railway lines as they are, and it is quite possible to make a road either across or under), but suppose you did either, who would use it, and what would it be used for? No dryman would ever take a road with a gradient when he could go upon a flat road; they would always take Flinders-street for a dry road, no matter what other road you make.

1578. You think that is the principal method of access to the docks?—Yes, for heavy traffic; foot traffic, or even carriage traffic, may be provided for, if absolutely necessary, by those who want it.

1579. You said the city council wanted to widen the street?—I think so.

1580. It was the Harbor Trust?—Was it? I do not remember which body it was.

1581. There has been a proposition made to extend Latrobe-street, among various propositions; it would abut upon the proposed docks; what do you think of that proposal?—I do not know exactly where the proposed docks are.

1582. That is a sketch that shows the whole thing,—[exhibiting a plan to the witness, who examined the same.]-I see Latrobe-street is opposite one of the proposed jetties of the dock. Just at that point, the cutting must be a matter of 25 feet deep; now is it to be over or under or round on the level; what is the proposition?

1583. The proposal is to extend Latrobe-street by a bridge over the railway?—No one would use it at all, except for walking, or buggies, or something of that sort, but, as far as goods traffic is concerned, it is out of the question; they would go a mile round rather than do that.

1584. During your term of office you commenced the excavation of a dock?—Yes.

1585. That dock, I presume, which you partly excavated is within the area of the site now chosen by the Harbor Trust for those docks?—If you would kindly read for the plan of the dock, I will show you at once.—[The plan was produced.]

1586. The site that you excavated, or caused to be excavated, is within the boundary, or partly so, of the land to be used by the Harbor Trust as a dock site?—Yes, part of the 213 acres. I do not see that there is any improvement in the substitution of the Harbor Trust design for the railway dock, not the slightest.

1587. Another question we have to consider is, how to get to and properly utilize the Crown lands lying east of the docks?—East of the docks?

1588. West of the docks, rather; that is the large area of Crown lands running down to the Saltwater River, bounded by the Yarra and Saltwater rivers; do you think that the widening of Flinders-street...
at the foot of Spencer-street, and the continuation of Flinders-street along the bank of the river, at a width of any two or three chains, would be a sufficient means of access, not only to the docks, but to the Crown lands beyond them?—You see you have Dudley-street and Roclip-street, and there is a little difficulty about Dudley-street, though I don't mind it; it is a very head way under the bridge now at Dudley-street, but I do not think it is quite enough; there ought to be at least 14 feet clear, whether there is or not I am not aware, but, at any rate for a portion of the traffic, you have a means of access to come direct, namely, by way of Dudley-street; now Flinders-street, if carried on—of course, you mean to say to carry it down the bank of the river?

1890. Yes, three chains wide?—There, again, you clash with the coal staging that has been already made by the department, or for the department, I am not sure which, for the landing of coal upon the river, instead of having to bring the coal from Williamstown in trucks. I had the plan arranged for the coal staging upon the River Yarra, and applied for and got permission to put the coal staging there, and it was partly done before I went away. I do not know what they have done with it since. That was a staging to land coal at, upon the River Yarra, to save the handling of the coal from Williamstown to wherever it is wanted here at the running sheds, and I think if you were to carry Flinders-street right down the river of the bank of the river, that, unless you turn round somewhere, it would clash with the coal staging somewhat. The coal staging must be about at the end of the dock.

1891. The road, of course, could be easily deviated to avoid that obstacle?—Yes; it would simply interfere with it as a straight line.

1892. Then I gather generally that you entirely disapprove of the production of those streets across the railway line, and the putting the station any further back than it is at the present time?—Certainly. I refused to part with it at that time, I may explain the reason why. At that time I had let a contract for grain and general goods sheds, but the cellars were for the storage of grain, produce, and wool; Victorian produce generally. These cellars were calculated to store pretty well all the grain that could be produced in the colony that was not going away by sea, and as far as I can remember, and subject to correction, upon this point, because figures are not very easy things to remember; but I think there was 600,000 superficial feet of space; of course that does not affect the cubical contents except as indicating what surface space you have. I think there was 600,000 feet. The access to those grain sheds was to be obtained from Flinders-street by dray by adult; there was to be an adult from the level of Flinders-street into the grain sheds. The floor of the grain sheds would have been only just high enough for the water to fall to Flinders-street, and all the drains that came there for goods, to take away grain, or wool, or other goods, instead of coming upon the line, interfering with the running of the trains, and crossing the lines, would go in from adults leading from Flinders-street; that was the reason I did not want to give up any of the land. I may as well remark here that on the calculation, made in the department, of a halfpenny a ton per week storage, the grain would have paid the department seven per cent. for the occupation of the portion occupied by it.

1893. And the land would have been always available for carrying out a scheme of the kind?—The land is available now. They cancelled the contract after I left. I think they gave the contractor £16,000 to give it up—he never would have made half-a-crown out of it, having taking the contract low—and they filled up the cellar again. I do not know who gained by it, but I know the producer loses 5d. a bushel by it.

1894. When you excavated your dock, as it is called, your primary object was to obtain the stuff to fill up the station yard with, was it not?—Yes, that was the original object.

1895. Did you find that the material excavated was good for the purpose?—The best material that ever was placed, without exception, for filling up a railway yard.

1896. Do you think the same kind of material covers the entire swamp?—I do.

1897. Then building would be a very simple process?—A very simple process. There is a place I filled in here—[indicating on plan]—at North Melbourne to divide 12 goods traffic from the passenger traffic; it had been divided, there had been a block here long ago. There had been a very nasty swamp at North Melbourne, and I got the thanks of the Melbourne Corporation for filling it up—not that the thanks amounted to much. There was one place upon that part of the swamp where we were tipping 2,000 tons of stuff a day for nearly three weeks without making any appreciable impression, that is to say raising it. It raised the land on both sides, and spewed it up on both sides to the level of the rail; but we did nothing to go about it, and now I would venture to say you could build a cathedral upon it. The swamp formation when used as filling is good enough for anything.

1898. Do you think that the land at present being occupied by the Railway department for railway purposes is being put to its best use in the interest of the public?—I do. I am very sorry that they let the other go. I am very sorry that they allowed the Harbour Trust to touch that 218 acres at all; I am sure they will never put it to so good a purpose, nor for the same money.

1899. Do you know the cost to the department of offsetting the formation from the excavation that was mentioned just now?—Yes, I know.

1900. What was the cost?—Ninepence halfpenny a cubic yard, getting, crossing the goods and the passenger traffic, transit, and putting in situ.

1901. That is the stuff that came out of the so-called dock?—Yes.

1902. How does that compare with the previous prices?—It is only a third of the previous prices; only 33 per cent. of the previous prices, or very little more. I suppose it is not more than 50 per cent. of the prices they are paying to-day.

1903. Does Mr. Woods know the price that it cost the department to take the stuff out of the Kensington Hill?—I suppose it must be over 2s.; 2s. 6d. I should think.

1904. Before Sir John Coode promulgated his scheme for the new cut and the docks in connection with the large basin, you meant to have a cut of nearly double the width of his?—Yes, 300 feet. I sent him the liigraphical plan of it.

1905. I presume you did that with the view of relieving the low lands of Melbourne from floods?—Yes.

1906. Do you think Sir John Coode's cut, 300 feet wide, will relieve the low lands in West Melbourne from the effect of floods?—No, I do not.

1907. Especially such a great dock, as that of 1863?—I do not; and I never did think so.
1709. Have you any idea of whether the bulk of the traffic that there will be between Melbourne and those docks when they are constructed will be what you call heavy traffic or light traffic?—Heavy traffic, I think.

1710. The bulk of it will be heavy traffic?—I think so.

1711. And are you of opinion that no communication which might be constructed in extension of Collins-street, or Bourke-street, or La trobe-street, would be avoided of for the purpose of that traffic?—Certainly not for the heavy traffic.

1712. Not by any underground way?—No, because you have gradients in both cases.

1713. Do you consider the gradient leading from Dudley-street—that is steeper still?—I do not think it is steeper.

1714. I do not mean merely from under the bridge, but to get up to the top of the hill?—I know it is steep, but we do not think it is steeper.

1715. Is it such a gradient that the heavy traffic would not face it?—I think the heavy traffic will evade Dudley-street as much as possible.

1716. That being so, is it your opinion that there is no outlet for the heavy traffic except Flinders-street?—I think not.

1717. Are you of opinion that Flinders-street is sufficient, for all time to come, for the heavy traffic that there will be between Melbourne and those docks?—I do not know much about all time to come.

1718. Of course we must face an increase!—But I do know that, with modern appliances, you could make Flinders-street carry it—I do not know what with, but there is a very considerable width between the north side of Flinders-street at present and the Yarra; and I think the whole of that ought to be made into streets, with either railways, tramways, roads, or anything else you like, or all put together.

1719. You are aware that, even if Flinders-street were widened, as you propose, from the Gasworks up to the corner of Spencer-street, it becomes, at that point, narrow again?—It does.

1720. Then how do you propose to get—are you aware that, at the present time, there are complaints of the under-street is unable to take the traffic that now exists?—I have heard of that, and can easily understand it, because there are places where two trains can scarcely pass. Instead of that, ten trains should be able to pass; there is width enough.

1721. You spoke of places where two trains cannot pass—are you referring to places between the present railway yards and the sheds?—Yes.

1722. Assume that all that is swept away, and it is widened down to the wharf; when you come to Spencer-street you are in a narrow portion again?—Not necessarily. You could go as wide as you like up to the Falls Bridge.

1723. And still have this overhand viaduct?—Yes; that would not interfere with it at all.

1724. What space between the viaduct and the north side of Flinders-street would there then be according to your idea?—The viaduct would stand on cast-iron pillars, pure and simple; and would not interfere with the roadway at all, you may say, for every arch would be available, I do not care how wide you make it.

1725. I do not follow that—the viaduct, as I understand it, takes a sort of curve, and comes up Flinders-street?—Yes.

1726. As you come from the Gasworks, I can quite understand that you pass under the viaduct, at the junction of Spencer-street out into Flinders-street—then the viaduct is on your right hand side?—Yes, part of it.

1727. The whole of it, after that?—Not if you were to widen Flinders-street as wide as you wish, right up to the Falls Bridge.

1728. Beyond Spencer-street?—Yes, beyond Spencer-street.

1729. You mention that that is obstructed by a large shed, for one thing?—Yes.

1730. You are aware that it was put there by the Government?—I do not know who put it there. It is an obstruction anyhow; and there is a bit of a brick office there, put up by the Harbor Trust. I think it could be better used as a street, myself.

1731. Your opinion is that, for very many years to come, Flinders-street, if widened as you propose, will be amply sufficient for all the heavy traffic that would pass to and fro from the docks when constructed?—Yes, I think so, with modern appliances. "Modern appliances" mean tramways, either for goods or passengers. You can have tramways for goods. You can put two or three goods trams in Flinders-street, and still allow for all your wheel traffic and passenger traffic too. You could have your goods tram-trains—they are not trains really; they are railways; they are not tramways in any sense—that is a mistake. You could have your street railways in Flinders-street, and at the same time your wheeled traffic, and they do not need to clash in any way, as I think. With modern appliances, and taking into consideration the fact that the street is level. The heavy traffic will always go to the level street—I think no fear exists that it would carry the traffic very well.

1732. Supposing you have all the heavy traffic in Flinders-street, as you say, notwithstanding the tramway and the viaduct on one side, if the heavy traffic seeks the level it will find its way to Elizabeth-street, and we shall be blocked in the middle of the city before it is distributed?—I do not know what sort of a block you would have there. If they would face the little hills, they could turn off at King-street, they could turn off at William-street, and they could turn off at Queen-street, and they could turn off at the Falls Bridge.

1733. No, Queen-street is too steep?—No, all the traffic that requires to go south would break off at the Falls Bridge.

1734. But speaking now of the heavy traffic that would have to be distributed to the north side of Flinders-street—if you concentrate it in Flinders-street because it is a level street—it seems to me that the traffic that Flinders-street naturally seek to go on as far as Elizabeth-street before it is distributed?—You see, along with the docks, I had planned out a range of warehouses that would have been three-quarters of a mile long—the full length of this (or north) side of the dock; and through those warehouses the lines were planned to go; and those warehouses were to be fitted up with hydraulic lifts, and to be three or four stories high, as the case might be; and these warehouses would have relieved the very traffic you talk of, because, instead of being compelled to take a thing from the ship's side and store it here, there, and anywhere, you
would have had room to store it in the warehouses. Some would go away by train, some by road; and really, if they had those warehouses alongside the docks, I do not know where this great heavy traffic is to go to.

1735. We have it that fully 90 per cent of the goods that comes into the port has to be brought into Melbourne to be sent out into the country to be re-packed, and so on?—They would re-pack it in the warehouses. Of course, I am quite prepared to admit that it would interfere with private property to a considerable extent. That a man who has a warehouse and everything ready for packing and so on would be interfered with in his prospects, I admit; but if you confine your attention to the mere handling of goods, their packing and re-packing, the fact that you have them alongside the railway and alongside the shipping at the same time, and that all this work can be done in those establishments arranged for the purpose, where you can take the goods out of the ship and put the packages into the railway truck on the one hand, or pop it into a lorry on the other, would render a lot of the heavy haulage that now takes place unnecessary.

1736. I quite understand you to say that Latrobe-street is altogether out of the question?—Alltogether out of the question.

1737. For heavy traffic?—For heavy traffic. Of course, you can make a flying bridge over it for light traffic, buggies, and so on.

1738. Are you aware that it is proposed by the Commissioners to build their station abutting upon Collins-street, and to make a sort of cul-de-sac of the end of Collins-street into their own grounds?—I am not aware. I have not seen the plans.

1739. I believe that is the present proposal of the Railway Commissioners?—I understand the meaning of it.

1740. And give an “end-on” station?—And give an “end-on” station, the best station you can have.

1741. Would it not be possible to connect the viaduct with the station; could they not raise the railway beyond that, so that Collins-street might be extended under it?—You can extend Collins-street under it without raising the railway.

1742. You might extend it, but I mean for the purposes of being useful?—You might take the full width of Collins-street under the railway and come out at the Gasworks, if it is worth while to go under the railway in order to get to the Gasworks. There you have it, but those that want to do so should do it with their own money.

1743. Never mind who bears the cost. I want to get at the question of what access can be provided, and then we will see what advantages or disadvantages there are in it. Is it possible, while preserving an end-on station on the railway, to connect the traffic between that is proposed to go over the viaduct, and yet give access for heavy traffic into Collins-street?—I do not think the heavy traffic would look at it.

1744. In any case?—In any case, no; whether it is under or over.

1745. Why?—Because it is not level, and they will seek the level.

1746. What would it be?—I don’t know. I imagine there would be 1 in 40. It is more than that. One in 40 gradient is quite easy. A good deal of the traffic would go on a 1 in 40.

1747. That is what I mean?—I do not know. If you have a section with the levels you could see.

1748. I am told that Mr. Greere stated that the gradient would be 1 in 40, and afterwards withdrew that and substituted 1 in 18?—There is quite a difference between 1 in 40 and 1 in 18.—[The Chairman read the portion of Mr. Greere’s evidence referred to. See question 366.]

1749. Could not the viaduct be adapted; can you suggest any way of giving access?—I was just about to explain that you can carry Collins-street under the railway and come out at the Gasworks without interfering with the railway at all.

1750. Can you do that so as to be efficient?—That could be ascertained in two minutes, if you can see the difference between the levels of the two places, and the distance between the two points.

1751. Do you know those data?—I do not.

1752. Is it possible to have a viaduct on a different level from that of the yard?—No, and there is no necessity for it.

1753. It is not a question of necessity. If there is a necessity for access to the locks then, of course, I want to see. Assume that there was a necessity to provide access for the heavy traffic through such a street as Collins-street, how would you do it?—To make it go through Collins-street?

1754. Assuming it is a necessity?—I would commence with closing up Flinders-street, so that they could not go anywhere else.

1755. I am assuming that Flinders-street is found not to be enough for the heavy traffic, and that some other means has to be provided. Then I will assume that Collins-street is supposed to be the next best adapted street for the purpose: how would you extend that street so as to give that access, and still to retain to the railway department the benefits of connexion with Flinders-street?—I would go under the railway without disturbing it. Right under the yard altogether.

1756. At the Prince’s-bridge Station you have two lines running alongside one another at different levels?—Yes.

1757. Would it not be possible to have the through traffic running over the viaduct at one level, and have a terminal station for the country traffic at another level?—Quite right, provided you have about 20 chains of a gradient to do it. You must run back 20 chains at least.

1758. Is not that available?—No, it would make it very awkward in the yard, and you must go under the lowest—it would not make a bit of difference. Here is Collins-street, we are right opposite to it now. There is nothing on earth to prevent Collins-street being carried through its full width, right to the Gasworks; nothing at all.

1759. Nothing but the money?—It would not cost much money.

1760. You have talked about extending Flinders-street, so as to connect with the part of the swamp to the westward, which is colored yellow upon the small plan?—Yes.

1761. How do you get across the dock entrances?—I see you have a swing bridge across here. I suppose that is the meaning of it.

1762. What width would those bridges have to be to take all this traffic from the docks, and give this connexion, assuming the yellow land may all be used for some great public purpose?—I do not
consider I am called upon to criticise these designs, and what you are asking me to do now is to criticise these designs. In the first place, I do not believe in these designs at all in any way.

1763. Assume that docks of some kind are to be constructed?

1764. Across those dock entrances there must be connections, if your idea of connecting the city with the yellow land is through Flinders-street?—No, I come down there on both sides, both the north side and the south side of the dock, the railway dock, as I call it. Of course there was no necessity to carry it on to the Saltwater River then. There would be no objection, so far as the traffic goes.

1765. That is assuming your scheme was carried out?—Yes. What they are going to do with that I do not know, I am sure. They will get into a muddle with it—of that I am sure.

1766. You say there is no difficulty in continuing Collins-street under the railway?—Yes, I say so.

1767. It has been stated to the Committee that to do that there would be a grade of 1 in 18?—I do not know the grade. It is ascertainable in five minutes.

1768. In making that statement it has also been said that it is governed by the viaduct?—No, the viaduct has nothing at all to do with it.

1769. Not to pass under the viaduct?—It does not pass under the viaduct there.

1770. Not Collins-street?—No.

1771. Then how would you extend it?—Straight as it is. The viaduct would not commence for two chains of where we are sitting.

1772. How would you pass under the rails and connect the viaduct with the station—how would you pass Collins-street underneath it?—I think there is a misapprehension as to where Collins-street is. The present level of the rails in this yard would be continued to the southern side of Collins-street, and the viaduct would not commence till you had passed the southern side of Collins-street.

1773. Then how would you continue Collins-street—through the railway yard or under the railway yard?—Under the railway yard.

1774. Then what headway would you have?—The ordinary headway, 15 feet.

1775. To go from Spencer-street underneath the railway?—Not from Spencer-street. You would have to ramp it away near King-street.

1776. You would begin to lower Collins-street further back?—Yes.

1777. That could hardly be entertained?—That is the only way it could be done.

1778. You would commence to pass under the railway ground on the western boundary of Spencer-street?—On the western boundary of Spencer-street.

1779. The whole of the grade?—Nearly the whole of it, not quite all; you would have a little grade in the street, and, of course, the longer the line you get the less the gradient; that is all.

1780. With reference to the approach to this West Melbourne portion, do not you think the North Melbourne station might be used for that purpose?—Not only has the bridge been turned off to Footscray; but then there is everything to hoist to the top of that bridge.

1781. Then you do not see any access to this land?—I do not see any access to this land, except first of all by Dudley-street, where you could turn, and then you would have to go under the works they are now constructing for the new running sheds. They have got a bank now between the railway and the running sheds that they are constructing, and if you wanted a road you must go either over or under on the top, one of the three.

1782. You are of opinion that if Flinders-street is widened about two chains, and properly made, it would be ample access to all that country?—I do think so. You could make it that width right up to the Falls Bridge.

1783. I have a plan here that may perhaps assist you in giving evidence. I will read some figures from it to you, and then ask you a question. Flinders-street, at the nearest point to the Gasworks, would be 156 feet wide?—Is that between the wharf and the Gasworks?

1784. That is at the south-west corner?—Is it between the wharf and the Gasworks?

1785. Yes; and at the nearest corner of the Gasworks, 26 feet, that is opposite the street leading to Williams’s factory?—The width there would be controlled a good deal by the narrowest point.

1786. At the narrowest spot, south of the present railway reserve, where the street is now only some 30 to 40 feet wide, it will be widened to three chains?—Yes.

1787. And at the corner, where you say the drill-shed is an obstruction, the street is at present 258 feet wide?—Yes. Of course, I know they have got a notion into their heads to take Flinders-street in a straight line, and cut off anything that comes there. I declined to let them have that when I had anything to do with it, and I should again if I had the chance.

1788. Seeing that at no part would the street be less than 136 feet wide, and at one point it would be 258 feet wide, do you think that that street would be sufficient to give access to the docks?—I am looking now at the plan of the Gasworks. I suppose if you can shift a railway you can shift the Gasworks, cannot you? There is a narrow neck at one corner.

1789. That is 136 feet?—You take a piece off that corner, and take it up to the line, there is only a front wall; there is nothing in it. I do not see why you should not take a piece of the gasworks; they are doing nothing with it. I would take away that front wall altogether, and build them a new one.

1790. At that extremely narrow point the lands are Crown lands still extrelye are; I have the plan before me. There is a portion at the back of the Gasworks that I had filled up to the flood level—eight or nine acres, I think.

1791. Then you say that Collins-street could be easily extended to the Gasworks but your proposal would necessitate going back a long distance, and grading down 200 yards or 300 yards back?—I was thinking about gently at King-street.

1792. Would not that entail an immense amount of compensation to property holders?—I do not know, I am sure, what compensation it would entail. Judging from the Richmond Swan-street crossing, if they have had no compensation for putting that crossing there, I do not think they could claim much for altering the gradient of the street.

1793. Leaving Collins-street at its present level so far as Spencer-street, and then going to the dock, and getting underneath the viaduct, the grade would be 1 in 15?—It would be a very stiff grade there.

1794. And that assumes that the viaduct must be lifted two feet higher than the Act of Parliament states?—The viaduct really would not come in at all till after you have passed Collins-street with the rails. It begins on the south side of Collins-street.
1795. But directly you get Collins-street underneath the railway line, to all intents and purposes that part of the line becomes a viaduct?—You can call it what you like; but at the present time you would be simply tunnelling under the line. It is purely a question of the levels of the rails, and it would be very inconvenient to alter the levels of the rails there, because they are laid out upon a general scheme for the whole yard. I think when I undertook the alteration of the yard in 1878 there were no less than eight or nine different levels of rails here, and nothing could be more inconvenient or costly in working. I think they were using thirteen shunting engines in doing the bit of traffic there was about here at that time.

1796. This proposed suburban road was to be upon the boundary line between the passenger traffic and the goods traffic. If that goods traffic is to be kept quite distinct from the passenger traffic as is proposed, would there be this difference of level, as there would be upon the crossing from one to the other?—I do not know what road you refer to.

1797. The suburban line, the connecting line on to the viaduct is proposed to be on the far side of the passenger station?—That is from here?

1798. Yes, if so (if it is to be between the two distinct systems of railways that rightly have no connection with each other), there seems to me a serious objection to the difference of level between those two?—I do not know exactly what is now the difference in the levels between the rails in Flinders-street and the rails in Spencer-street?

1799. That is not the point I wish information upon at the present time; it is this—You say that it is objectionable to have different levels in the yard?—Yes.

1800. But in this case the lines that would be upon the different levels from the others have no connection with the others; they form the boundary line between the passenger system and the goods system, which are to have no connection with one another here; the connection is to be away out. Now, might not the connecting line that is to connect with the viaduct be upon a different level from either the goods line or the passenger line, without any very serious inconvenience, there being no proposed traffic across it?—I am afraid I do not quite understand you.

1801. The difficulty of extending Collins-street lies in the fact that if the connecting line, the line from Spencer-street to Flinders-street is to be carried on at the level of the present yard, the road under it would be too steep?—Yes.

1802. If it is to be straight and not to interfere with Spencer-street?—Yes.

1803. To start from Spencer-street and get upon the connecting line?—What connecting line?

1804. Connecting Spencer-street with Flinders-street, that has been always spoken of as the viaduct. You object to its being called a viaduct, and I call it now the line that is to connect with the viaduct and to connect the two stations?—Yes.

1805. That is proposed to be, as the plans submitted to us show, between the passenger system, ending here at the end-on station, and the goods system which is beyond?—Yes, quite right.

1806. And there is to be no communication in the station between the two systems?—No, only on the viaduct.

1807. There is to be no communication between the goods system in the station and the passenger lines in the station, the connexion is to be further back. Now, could we not start further back, 20 chains, as you said, and thus give more headway here, coming on at a different level from the general level of the yard, without serious inconvenience?—For one traffic or both?

1808. In order to get more headway for Collins-street?—Do you mean for one traffic or both?

1809. For the connecting line between Spencer-street Station and Flinders-street Station?—Yes, I know; but two railways are proposed to go upon that viaduct.

1810. For both—necessarily for both?—Your proposition means raising the level of this yard.

1811. Not at all. I ask you, could it not be otherwise done?—I mean it means raising the passenger portion of it.

1812. No, no. It could be done in that way of course, but that is not what I am now suggesting. What I ask your opinion upon is this—the leaving the country terminal station, which is built here, at its present level, and leaving the goods terminal station, which is to be on the other side, at its present level?

—You are not now alluding to the wood siding and so on?

1813. Leave them as they stand. Could not you start 20 chains back, as you just now mentioned, and bring the station to the country station with the southern system upon a different level here, at the extension proposed of Collins-street, that is to say, five, six, or eight feet higher if necessary without interfering with the other traffic?—You could not do it without raising the yard; you have got to shave your engines; you must have the same level. You may just look upon it as if this table represented the yard. You cannot raise one portion of it without raising the others.

1814. I am not suggesting that you should raise any portion of the yard at all. I ask now if, practically, we could not build a wall—of course a wide wall—between the passenger yard and the goods yard?—What do you want it for?

1815. Never mind. Could it be done?—Of course you could build a wall anywhere where you have the material and site.

1816. If you can build a wall two feet thick without any serious injury, can you build one 30 feet thick?—Yes, of course, if you have plenty of bricks.

1817. And run four lines of rails upon the top of it?—Nothing to prevent your doing it. Now I begin to see what you mean. You mean to say you can run a bridge into the station, and that whenever you want to make use of the viaduct you back your trains and take the wedge—you go over the wedge.

1818. It has been put to us here that there is to be no connexion between the two things in the yard at all; this line that we are now speaking of is to be a line from Williamstown or from Essendon on to Brighton, and it does not interfere with the end-on station at all, and does not form any part of it?—The passengers would have to get out and in here.

1819. In fact there would be three levels instead of two in the present yard?—Yes.

1820. Would not the inconvenience to the Railway Department, caused by raising the viaduct several feet, much more than counterbalance any benefit by the access to the docks?—Yes. It is good to speculate about, but no one would use it in actual practice. But what you want is the simplest possible arrangements; you cannot have your arrangements with a railway yard too low or too simple. You want them level and
simple, and to have plenty of room. If you get into a system of viaducts and all that sort of thing it is confusion. Besides, the game is not worth the candle.

1831. Mr. Wright was speaking of the portion of land connecting the viaduct with the Spence-street station-yard. If the viaduct, at the confluence of the viaduct, was placed sufficiently far to the west, so as to enable Collins-street to pass underneath it at a grade of 1 in 35 or 40, would you see any difficulty in making Collins-street an open cut, keeping the passenger station to the north of Collins-street, and placing the connection with the viaduct at a distance to the west that would give 1 in 35 or a grade? That would be by a series of S curves; only in that way could you get at it.

1832. No, not S curves! When you speak of an end-on station, if I understand right, it would be an end-on station only so far as the city traffic is concerned.

1833. An end-on station to Collins-street?—An end-on station to Collins-street as far as city traffic is concerned, but not an end-on station as far as through traffic is concerned?

1834. Yes, keeping the viaduct to the west of that station, so that there is headway for a street parallel to Collins-street, to pass underneath it?—I do not know. I should like to see the plans before I would pronounce an opinion. In the meantime it appears to me that you would have to have a system of S curves in order to get away from one line to the other, to go west to get to the viaduct.

1835. I mean keeping the viaduct sufficiently far to the west that the grade could be got underneath it?—Even then you do not get rid of the difficulty unless you raise the line.

1836. Mr. Greene gave evidence that the line of the viaduct in the Bill is 7 chains from Spencer-street. If that would give a grade of about 1 in 18 to pass under or over it, and that was moved out to 14 chains, it would give a grade of double 1 in 18 to pass under.—Yes; but before pronouncing on anything of that sort, or giving an opinion upon it (the thing is entirely new to me) I should like to see the plans.

But, generally speaking, I think it is a mistake to interfere with what I may call the simple, level, and extensive arrangement of a station, especially of a station that is almost a terminal station—is now a terminal station as much as any we have in the colony.

1837. Then, if you took the through traffic to the extreme west of the station, there would be a great number of lines to cross before you got to the through lines.—Of course; it is like a break of gauge; it is a break of journey. In the same compartment—not merely in the same train, but in the same compartment—you will have people getting out at Spencer-street, and others getting out at Flinders-street, when the viaduct is completed, and others may be getting out elsewhere. If the suburban system alluded to here to-day were established upon the lines, the end-on station would work in this way—those who came here wanting to go to Williamstown or Brighton, or other suburbs, would just pop into a suburban train, as it was passing through.

1838. What is your reason for believing that Latrobe-street would not receive. If necessary, Flinders-street from the large amount of traffic to which it would be subject?—Because you would have to hoist every ton up so high. I do not care how you hoist it, whether by a direct line or by a gradient, but you have to get it up.

1839. Are you aware that, so far as goods going from Melbourne to the docks are concerned, they go on a level at Latrobe-street?—Yes; but the trouble comes in at that point; you are 25 feet above the rails there.

1840. Yes. We are informed that there would be no gradient at all on the city side, and in 30 on the other side.—It would be far better to have definite information. You could have a plan upon the wall that would show exactly the level of each point and the distances between them, and it would be a very simple calculation to say, "Such and such a level and such and such a distance; that gives such a gradient."

1841. There is such a plan—[handing a plan to the witness]?—I see this is natural scale. Here is Latrobe-street: the level of it upon this section is 31'-34', and the level of the rail is 27'-25', and the distance between the two.

1842. Are you aware that the Commissioners, and the department generally, look upon Latrobe-street as the street—possibly the first street or the principal street—that may take the traffic from the docks, and if you are aware of that, why would you think otherwise?—Yes, it is the most direct way to the docks.

1843. Are you aware that the extension of Latrobe-street leads right on to the docks?—I know that; I see it there. I was not aware that it could be got with 1 in 30. I thought it would have been more than that.

1844. If it can be got at 1 in 30 would it be a great acquisition?—Yes. There is only one objection to it, and that is a very serious objection in a terminal station that looks already like a forest of signals, and that is the obstruction in the station—the obstruction of a viaduct across the station. I do not know of any railway objection except that, because you only want 14 feet under for the trains, and of course that would enable you to keep your viaduct down.

1855. Then Dudley-street—are you aware of the gradient there?—I do not know, but I should say that the gradients at Dudley-street, from where the railway crosses Dudley-street to the corner of the gardens.

1856. King-street?—King-street? I should say, has gradients of about 1 in 20, or 1 in 22.

1871. I think not—but I am not a witness—I am only speaking from guess.

1838. One in 27'-4" we have just been told?—I thought it was about 1 in 22.

1839. You appeared to say (very briefly and hurriedly) that because the road had been turned on the Footscray side, the North Melbourne bridge could not be made available for the docks?—I do not say "could not be made available." It’s got to go your pardon.

1840. I suppose you will admit that it is just as easy to make a road on the left as on the right?—Yes, every bit; in fact, it is easier, for it is half made, for they have made the wing. You have only to go half down the present roadway and then turn off wherever you like.

1841. Are you aware that the population upon the north is increasing very rapidly?—Quite aware of it.

1842. And that a very large amount of the goods that come to the Spencer-street station or to the docks, will be for consumption there?—I am quite aware of it.
84. Are you aware that a large amount of the goods (we call everything "goods," timber, coal, firewood, and everything else) has to go to the north? —I know that.
85. Therefore it cannot be an economical reason? —And, indeed, when I was Commissioner of Railways I may say that I had planned out coal and firewood and timber sidings for North Melbourne, that I was going to put there as far as the railway was concerned (of course had nothing to do with the docks) recognizing that the place had a chance.
86. I understand that you admit that the North Melbourne bridge, in common with other streets, such as Dudley-street and La trobe-street, can be made available? —Certainly. I only talk of what is.
87. If La trobe-street viaduct to take the traffic were made to a gradient of 1 in 20, would the heavy traffic avail themselves of it? —Not if they could help it.
88. Would the light traffic do so? —Yes, they would, for two reasons; first, it would not be so much used, and it would give quick access to and from the docks.
89. And that would ease Flinders-street? —Certainly; but our conversation has been principally about the heavy traffic.
90. But the whole of the heavy goods coming from the docks would not be sent only to Flinders-street or Flinders-lane; a good portion goes to the lane as well, but you are not aware that a great deal of it goes to the higher level eventually. May it not be just as well to take the higher level at once? For instance, that large establishment, Goldsborough's, in La trobe-street? —No doubt if they had a viaduct they might take La trobe-street at once. The only objection that I see to a viaduct over the railway at a terminus is the one I mention, that it leads to confusion. It leads to an increase in the number of signals, and possibly it leads to the chance of what, after somebody is killed, we call an accident.
91. And may prevent a re-arrangement of the yard? —No, I do not think it would necessarily do that.
92. Would not a large portion of the traffic in heavy goods go by railway up country? —The warehouses that I planned alongside the dock were intended principally for that, for all country-bound goods would have been re-arranged and requetted and fixed in those warehouses, and dropped into the trucks —but of course they would not pay Melbourne any toll then —that is where the minister came in.
93. But merchants will forward a great deal of stuff from those docks by rail? —No doubt about it.
94. Without the parcel being broken up? —No doubt about it.
95. Engines and boilers and all sorts of things? —Yes, all sorts of machinery. But the assumption that has been gone upon here to day is that everything that comes by sea is to go somewhere near the Cathedral to be packed. It is all nonsense —pure nonsense.
96. You think that a distribution of the timber traffic to the suburbs —North Melbourne, for instance, and other places —would be an advantage? —I do. I think every considerable suburb ought to have its own timber and firewood and coal sidings and staging.
97. And bricks it may be? —Bricks, they are heavy traffic. All traffic like that.
98. If that is carried out it would not be necessary that the whole of the supply of firewood for Melbourne should be brought to the present site? —Certainly not.
99. That site would be available? —I do not think so. I think it would be all choked —as it is now.
100. It would be available as far as the firewood traffic is concerned? —Certainly; but if you look at the models I had made about it you find no less than three great goods sheds that would not leave an inch of land available; and when you take into consideration the fact that Spencer-street station will probably represent eventually thousands of railway, the idea of taking away a bit of land in the wood sidings or anything of that sort, and taking it away from the department, would appear sxeezidely ridiculous.
101. Would you consider it good business to concentrate the whole of the traffic of that nine thousand miles of railway in this particular yard? —No, you could not do it—you have not room enough.
102. Would not that point to the necessity of getting yard accommodation in another direction? —In every direction where you can.
103. And only a portion of it in this yard? —Only a portion of it. I wanted to get Williams's four acres and a half, and I am very sorry my colleagues did not buy it. I suppose that you understand that I mean by nine thousand miles of railways, that when Queensland is connected with New South Wales, that and New South Wales and Victoria represent nine thousand miles. That is really what you have to look at.
104. Looking at Melbourne as the chief sea port of the country, would you prefer to have one large station of 250 acres or three 80 acres each? —I would rather have one large yard of 250 acres, because you have not a divided management.
105. Then you have concentrated your traffic? —No, in any case you cut up your traffic as much as you can to suit the people; but in any case I would rather have one large station-yard instead of three eighteen. You have one set of officers, and one management, and everything else; otherwise you have to multiply your cost of handling by three.
106. I understood you to say that you thought it would be necessary to distribute the traffic? —Yes, I do so.
107. That would be by three medium-sized yards? —There might be thirty; put one at every considerable suburb. I think there ought to be accommodation for coal, firewood, timber, bricks, timber, and all large traffic of that sort at every considerable centre of population wherever a railway goes.
108. Wheat, wool, &c.? —Yes, everything of the sort.
109. Then your large yard will not be required? —I beg your pardon, it will be required, when you consider that you have such an immense drainage of territory, right from Northern Queensland and South Australia, you may have to drain the whole of it here; for I hope to see the day when Melbourne will be considered the heart of Australia for goods, and I think with a little good management it might be done.
110. Is it intended that the viaduct shall be confined to passenger traffic only? —Certainly not; the passenger traffic would run on separate lines, but upon the same viaduct.

The witnesses withdraw.
William Thwaites examined.

1871. By the Commission.—What position do you hold in the Public Service?—I am engineer of reclamation works in the Public Works Department.

1872. What works do you mean?—Reclamation of swamps and raising low-lying grounds about Melbourne. That is one of my offices, and it is in that office that I am here.

1873. Has any work of reclamation upon plans of yours ever been put out near the Saltwater River?—In October 1885, I submitted a plan for the reclamation of the area known as the West Melbourne Swamp then belonging to the Crown, and that plan was favourably considered by Mr. Service, the then Premier—[producing a plan].—I think perhaps it would be better if I explain this plan; that will save a considerable amount of time. My scheme was to raise that area of Crown Lands then available for either sale or lease. That area then embraced the whole of the portion B together with the portion tinted yellow.

1874. Will you describe the boundaries?—The area tinted yellow belongs to the Crown. The area tinted red now is vested in the Railway Department, and the area tinted blue is vested in the Harbour Trust by the last Harbour Trust Amendment Act in 1885. I suggested that the whole of the area B together with that tinted yellow should be reclaimed. The scheme then submitted was for raising these two areas. Since that, in 1886, the area "B" has been vested in the Railway Department. At the request of Mr. Greene, I forwarded my scheme for the reclamation of these areas to the Railway Department for consideration. The result of that was, that in a few days they asked the Crown Lands Department to reserve "B," and they adopted a modification of the scheme by letting a contract for raising a portion of area "B." The Railway Department have started an excavation on the west side of "B" on their own ground, which about coincides with the centre line of the most easterly of the proposed canals, and with the material from that they are raising the north portion of "B." The suggestion for raising this ground area tinted yellow was this, that canals should be excavated through the swamp in the directions shown shaded blue. These canals were to be excavated to a depth of 20 feet, and 300 feet wide at low water, and 220 feet wide at the base, that is at the bottom: and the material obtained from the canal was to be spread over the swamp, so as to raise the swamp above flood level. In 1885 I suggested that the area of the swamp should be lifted to an average height of five feet, and the average cost of that work would then have been £1,500. If the Government could have found £1,500 more, this land could have been transferred to a farmer. But since then I came to the conclusion that it would be better to raise it higher. Five feet would be scarcely above the level of the 1803 flood. I think if the ground is to be reclaimed for building purposes it should be raised at least seven feet four. That would make the cost of raising come to about £1,900 an acre. I thought it was advisable to provide roads round all the canals in the swamp, at least 150 feet wide, so as to allow not only proper road traffic, but also railway traffic, to the faces of all the canals in the portion suggested. Sir John Coode's docks are shown approximately. I have not got their exact position, but they are quite sufficiently definite for you to understand the idea of the scheme. In order to utilize the railway dock or the excavation which the railway people are now making as much as possible, it has been suggested to carry that dock into the first portion of Sir John Coode's scheme, which the Harbour Trust Commissioners have accepted—namely, Mr. Brady's dock. That will connect with Mr. Brady's dock near its entrance. In order that the greatest advantage should be obtained from these sites, the whole of them are entered by means of various lines of railway, easy of access from the central station. The railway line suggested along Sir John Coode's dock are carried across a swing bridge at the entrance of the excavation now being made by the Railway department, and carried thence into the areas reclaimed, or proposed to be reclaimed, in the swamp; the railway lines running completely round the faces of the three different areas into which it is divided. The great advantage of this scheme, it appeared to me, is this, that it not only will extend the harbour wharfage facilities of the port, which, of course, must be very great in the future; and if we are to deal with this area at all, we must deal with it in a comprehensive spirit, and with a full appreciation that we must not throw away any means of providing dock accommodation for the future by allowing it to pass out of the hands of the Government, to be all bought back at a future period at a very great cost. All these canals are ship canals. Upon a cross-section here are sections both of the Amsterdam ship canal and the Suez canal, and at the side the suggestion for a scheme of wharfage suitable for the spot is shown. The wharfage suggested should be provided with hydraulic cranes which can lift goods directly out of the holds of the vessels, and being raised the crane, is swung round, brought over the goods lines at the back of the wharf, and the material dropped into the truck, and when the material is there it can be gathered up and taken into the railway ground for transference up country; and if it is thought that the goods require to be warehoused, then these sites produced by the reclaimed land can be utilised as warehouses, and trucks can be run opposite to any warehouse anywhere along the frontages. The owner of the warehouse puts the truck upon a turn-table, and turns the truck into his warehouse. There is an ordinary overhead traveller to lift the material out of the truck, and it is upon the warehouse, and the ordinary handling by manual labour is reduced to a minimum. The cost of shipping, freight, and one thing and another would be materially decreased as against the system now adopted of landing the material, by hand labour into the lorry, then sending it into town, and shifting it into a warehouse in town, and when it goes up country shifting it from the warehouse to the railway, sending it to the railway station, putting it upon the platform, and then into a truck; whereas upon this system you have the whole thing under control by a system of mechanical appliances, and by this system it is looked upon that those sites would be ultimately of very great value. The swing bridges are included in the estimate of cost which has been developed at a cost of about 1s. 5d. per yard. Of course, the financial part of the business is the principal part of the whole scheme. The cost of the dock now being excavated by the Railway Department is either 1s. 4d. or 1s. 5d. However, my estimate is, at 1s. 5d. for the whole of the area. I think it is a price that it would be let at. The Harbour Trust could not ask less than that, but I cannot say that 1s. 5d. is a very fair price, and I feel confident the ground could be raised for that, and the result of the raising would be that we would have 277 acres of streets—271 acres available for building purposes, and 109 acres would be taken up by the canal accommodation and wharfage accommodation. The length of wharfage available by this scheme would be in linear distance about seven miles fifty-one chains, quite.
ample for a very large number of years, together with the proposed docks to be carried out ultimately by the Harbour Trust. After the canals are excavated, and the land is raised, I think that the proper thing would be to vest all the wharf frontages in the Harbour Trust, so as to make the whole wharfage facilities of the port come under their jurisdiction. There would be ample room for that, for the streets are 150 feet wide, and the H9 feet from the mast, and since the municipality to which it belongs to own that, and the Harbour Trust to own and look after the remaining area, that is about 64 feet between the 99 and the face of the dock. I may say a large portion of this area is a man’s land at present, and belongs to no municipality, and it has always seemed to me that this area has always presented the greatest facilities for the extension of the city westwards, for as the ground is at present occupied near the gasworks the extension of the city is thoroughly blocked, whatever extension might take place, even if Collins or Bourke streets be carried through, would be extremely small as compared with the area available tinted yellow.

1875. Will you explain how you obtain your access to it? — With regard to means of access, I think there are two ways, which appear to me to be the most feasible, from both a practical and engineering point of view, and they are by Flinders-street. Certainly, as an engineer, I think Flinders-street should be carried through at its present width, and upon its present lines.

1876. What do you mean by its present width? — Certainly not less than 98 feet. And then at Latrobe-street, means of access should be provided. Latrobe-street is really a most important means of access to Sir John Coode’s docks, for here we have the docks, Latrobe-street coming almost into the centre of them. Now, no matter what part of Melbourne you go to, from the centre of Sir John Coode’s northern dock, Latrobe-street is the easiest way unless you are going to the lower portion of Flinders-street and the area south of the Yarra; for no carter will take a cart up a hill if he can go on a level, and as the streets are rectangular, no distance will be lost. With regard to the northern dock of Sir John Coode’s, there is very little difference in the actual distance to go to any point of Flinders-street, to go by Latrobe-street, and then come down King-street, than if you went up to the railway reserve boundary where the road would be, and then to return along it towards Flinders-street. The only thing would be that no carter would like to go up the hill that he would have to go up gradients of about 1 in 20, and 1 in 25, if the other road is level; but to any area north of Bourke-street any carter would naturally go by the Latrobe-street route, because, if he were to go by Flinders-street, he would have to climb a gradient in any of the hills sloping down to Flinders-street of quite as great and stiff a character as he would by any approach which the Railway department might make to the corner of Latrobe and Adderley-streets, which is at a level of 50. There is a contour map of Melbourne — (producing the same) — upon it you can trace any point that is below a gradient of 50, and you find really that a very small portion of the city is actually below that point. It only consists of the whole of Spencer-street, King-street from Bourke to Flinders-street, Market-street from Collins to Flinders-street, and Queen-street from Collins-street to Flinders-street; those are the only portions of the streets of Melbourne which are really below the point which would be obtained by rising from the docks to the corner of Latrobe and Adderley-streets, and for a point north of that it certainly is easier to go by the Latrobe-street route than it is to go by the Flinders-street route. The Flinders-street route is the suitable and proper route for the warehouses between Flinders-lane and Flinders-street, and for the south of the Yarra. The Latrobe-street route is the proper route for all the area taken roughly, north of Bourke-street.

1877. I think you said your scheme contemplated filling up the land to the extent of seven feet four. Is that the average level that you propose, for, of course, some portions must be higher and some lower to give suitable rise and fall for the streets? — Seven feet four is the average. Part of the area is about four feet above low water, and part of it only about eighteen inches above low water. Included in the raising of this ground, there is also the raising of the Footscray-road. From the Saltwater river to where the Moonee Ponds channel crosses the road is pretty level. The Footscray bridge and road at present is a very high embankment, that is raised to a level, and for the remaining level, room is obtained by running water at all the frontages — gradually raising therefrom so as to give drainage in the street channels at two inches to the chain, a far better road would be obtained. Nine feet above low water mark actual level would be the actual level which the land would be raised if the larger scheme were adopted. As to other means of access, Dudley-street, of course, gives access as well as Latrobe-street. To the north point of the reclaimed land by way of Dudley-street, the distance from the junction of Spencer and Dudley streets would be just about a mile.

1878. Do you look upon the North Melbourne bridge as a means of access also to that? — Certainly I do. Miller-street bridge at present is built there, and the approach curves round towards the Footscray-road. That would give a means of access to the area tinted yellow; but the difficulty about area “B” is that it all belongs to the Railway department, and to obtain means of access to the docks of Sir John Coode’s from the Miller-street bridge would necessitate a road through “B,” which is a portion of the Railway ground.

1879. Do you contemplate any diversion of the house drainage and sewage from those casals, otherwise they would probably come into the same state as the Sandridge lagoons? — Certainly I do. I think all house slopes and first scumings of streets should be kept not only out of the Yarra, but out of all water-courses round Melbourne. We are getting into such a state in these water-courses that it will return with very great violence upon the heads of the people. I am just now lifting water from the Yarra river, and if any of the Commissioners want to know what the river water is really like, if they examine it, they will find it is nothing but pure unadulterated kitchen slops; and that is the sort of thing that is going into the river, which is becoming worse and worse; and while it is allowed to go on, the river will become a source of great danger to the population upon its banks. As to all these docks of Sir John Coode’s, not a single drop of house drainage should be allowed to come from them.

1880. Even excluding that, would they then remain pure themselves. What sewer do you propose? — The difficulty in canals of this kind, of course, is the same as you have in every part of the world. You have no artificial sewer. You have none in the docks in London; you have no artificial sewer in Liverpool Docks. It is not possible to have an artificial sewer unless you have a river running through, and by that means the water so small that the sewer is reduced to a minimum. It is almost impossible to provide any artificial sewer, and we have to face the fact, that while water port accommodation is provided you have to face dredging. Liverpool dredges about 700,000 tons per annum; from the East and West India Docks in London it is about 100,000 tons, and you have only to do here what
other people have to do. The dredging in the Yarra is not nearly so great as some of the French rivers like the Rhone and other rivers liable to floods. Wherever there are docks you have to face the dredging.

1881. You think Flinders-street, Latrobe-street, Dudley-street, and the bridge at Miller-street would give ample access to that part of West Melbourne? I do. Bourke-street would be a great facility in point of time to go to the docks; that would be a feature. It is the matter of finance, what for a small portion of the docks it is worth while to go to a great expenditure, for whether you move the railway back or put a viaduct over the lower ground or go under the railway, it means that the access by Bourke and Collins-streets must be very expensive, and it is just a question of whether the game is worth the candle. There is a distance of 21 chains in favour of the direct road as against either of the others.

1883. Even irrespective of the question of whether Latrobe-street has better gradients, and can be constructed very much cheaper; you still prefer it to the other?—I think for the great majority of the city, and metropolitan area Latrobe-street is much the shorter way. Collins-street and Bourke-street are merely shorter distances for Collins and Bourke-streets only.

1884. I mean, that if there are no more difficulties in one street than the other, you still think Latrobe-street is the best of the three?—If you have a certain amount of money to spend I think it better to spend it upon Latrobe and Flinders streets, than to spend it upon Bourke and Flinders streets. If you have any amount of money to spend you can send them all through, because they are all engineering possibilities; but the question is, are they financial possibilities?

1885. You say that the land would cost £2,000 an acre?—I will leave a memo. I have prepared about the various schemes with you. Of course the cost will vary according to the depth to which you fill it. If you fill to an average depth of five feet the cost will be upon the ground available for sale, £1,393 per acre or £5 6s. per foot frontage—the depth of the blocks averaging about 165 feet. If you raise six feet the cost will be £1,329 an acre or £4 4s. per frontage. If you raise it perfectly clear of the highest known flood, namely 1863, throughout the whole area it will cost £1,351, or £7 8s. per foot.

1886. What is that for the selected land?—Yes, it is. In the event of the grade of land, whether it would be leased, then the leased return per acre at five per cent, should be £50 per acre if raised five feet. It should be £52 per acre if raised six feet, and £58 per acre if raised the full height.

1887. Do you think it would be best to raise it to the full height to make it quite safe?—I think it would. I do not think the floods in the river will rise as high as in 1863 with the increased facilities we have now. I think it would be wise to keep the warehouses out of all possible danger of floods.

1888. Do you think the increased facilities are more than counterbalanced by the filling up of South Melbourne, and also the obstructions across the St. Kilda swamp by roads. There was, in 1863, a great rush of water through St. Kilda park and the Sandridge lagoon, which poured an enormous quantity of water into the sea?—Looking at it in that point of view, it should be remembered that every particle of dredged material placed on that area has been taken out of the river; though it has shocked up one portion of the river, you will have a much less flood discharge in the channel itself; and we must always remember that even though floods ran over those low-lying grounds, the depth of water was very small. It was not more than two or three feet in the places where the overflows took place; but the depth of water after the Harbour Trust have finished their present dredgings will be ten feet throughout; and, of course, water is always delayed considerably by any shallow passage through which it flows, as against any deep channel like the channels presented by Sir John Coole's cutting and the river, when the dredgings are completed.

1889. Of course you know there is no fall in Sir John Coole's channel?—Still you got a fall by the rise of a flood in the river. The velocity of any stream is always due to the surface fall. We always have to recollect that in 1863 the depth of water in the channel was only about 8 feet at the mouth, and the flood rose to a point close to the gages at 9.53.

1890. At some point up the river it was 33 feet, and there I obtained roughly the sectional area and the velocity, so I know approximately what was the discharge in 1863, and I found Sir John Coole's new cut would not carry off anything like the quantity?—[No answer.]

1891. Would the river be a discharging channel at all below a certain depth. Is it not merely a reservoir of dead water?—No, whatever the cause may be, no matter whether it be high tide or low tide, there is a certain water area to allow. At high tide, supposing there were no water coming down the river at all, that high tide would run pretty well up to Johnston-street bridge, and the whole water would be dead, but directly you put water in at the top of Dight's Falls, you raise the surface of the water above the level of the Bay, and you get a velocity due to the difference between the height at that point and the Bay, and that velocity is carried right throughout the whole water section.

1892. You speak largely of warehouses. Do you consider the ground there to be suitable for the erection of warehouses upon a very large scale?—Yes, I do. Of course it is not such good ground as might be obtained in other places, but there are many towns in the world—take, for instance, Chicago, and along the East River at New York—where there is a great deal worse foundation. For the first few years the structure put up there would be comparatively light as compared with warehouse sites in Melbourne; people would have larger warehouses, not warehouses of one, two, and three stories; the ground would get gradually consolidated, and then, as the ground became more valuable, you could build a heavier class of warehouses, and when the ground was more valuable it would pay the owners to put in a better class of foundation. As an instance, upon that particular area, I know of my own knowledge that you can drive steel piles any distance you like if you put in a driven pile that is simply like four sticks fastened together, and drive the pile so that it comes upon the head of that; you cannot drive the pile down at all with a monkey. And there is another thing about that area which I may
mention. In some experiments made in America piles were driven into ground much softer than any portion of this West Melbourne swamp, and those piles could be pulled out very easily on that particular day, but if left there a fortnight or three weeks you could not pull them out without very great power, and they would bear a very great weight upon the top of them.

1894. Does the same rule apply to the Harbour Trust?—No, it would not apply to the Harbour Trust.

1895. And you are aware of how much the pines as used by the Harbour Trust can support?—I would not like to say till I saw what the last blow with the monkey was.

1896. I made a calculation upon that matter, of how much it fell under the last blow of the monkey, and the dimensions of the piles, and so on, and I found that one of those piles in this soil would support a dead weight of four tons and a half. According to that, piles would support, any structure in this swamp, put them near enough?—It is only a question of how many piles you putting it, and put them near enough. The question of foundations in this swamp is a question of the future; it is not necessary to consider it now, for you will not need to in the buildings which will stand upon it. At Port Adelaide, at first they had very great difficulty with the ground, and there they build very heavy warehouses by paying attention to the foundations. It is only a matter of expense, and in future years, when the ground becomes more valuable, the owners can afford to do for a good cost in the foundation. This scheme includes dealing with the whole of the 660 acres in the area tinted yellow, and it includes three swing-bridges, and these swing-bridges provide for railway traffic and road traffic, so that trucks can pass along the centre of the railway bridge, and ordinary road traffic can also use the bridge, just similar to the bridge erected and in use for the Semaphore Railway at Port Adelaide. The whole scheme would cost £550,000. Of course, if you spend that in one year, it would be a very big thing, but the reclamation of a large area like this must be started with the Moonee Ponds area by itself, in a proper precipitation work on its own account; and my might be efficiently spent in starting part of the work, so that the work can be extended over ten, fifteen, or twenty years, according as Government had funds, and as each portion is reclaimed (it might be first started either at the north portion or the south portion), and as each portion is reclaimed it is available, either for sale or lease, as Parliament may decide.

1897. Does that £550,000 provide for raising it to the full extent?—It provides for raising it to the full height, above the highest flood known, and for the bridges for access for the whole area.

1898. Have you thought out whether, upon the leasing basis, the work could be made profitable?—I was making some inquiries to-day. In the South Melbourne flats, the leasing rents are, I think, from £100 upward.

1899. One hundred pounds, for what?—Per acre. The interest on the cost of this ground would be £100 per acre. With its closeness to the docks, and the railway facilities and shipping facilities it affords, I think we might quite expect to get at least £100 per acre rent for it.

1900. It is an advantage of your scheme, then, that it does not interfere in the slightest degree with either the docks scheme of the Harbour Trust, or the existing railway station?—No, it is made to fit in with everything as much as it possibly could, and the cross sections show the Commissioners that there is quite as much as it serve on each side of the proposed canals as you get in the whole of the Amsterdan shipping canal, or the Suez canal: in fact, a far smaller water than the Suez canal, for the Suez canal water area is really only about 70 feet wide.

1901. Will the material stand at the slopes you have given to it?—I have kept the weight off the slopes as much as possible, by providing a timber platform for the railway tracks to run on, so that the weight does not come upon the back of the piles. It is minimized, so that a large portion of the soil upon the sides of the canal actually carries only its own weight.

1902. You say 106 acres would be absorbed in canals?—Yes.

1903. Yet would not recommend your scheme to be carried out unless, concurrently with it, the sewerage of Melbourne is completed?—The drainage of this particular portion of the district could be carried out without the drainage of Melbourne.

1904. Forty 106 acres of stagnant water, collected from the streets and the kitchen slopes, as you say, of Melbourne! Would the water be a terrible nuisance, unless the sewerage of the city were taken in hand at the same time?—This plan which I have here is a plan which I am now preparing, at the request of the Premier, in order to produce a scheme to drain the Moonee Ponds Valley; that will keep the drainage out of these canals and docks. At present this channel delivers the drainage from Hotham, Brunswick, Flinders, and Batman into the Yarra rivers, which the Commissioners must have seen when they were visiting the spot. From the Flemington-road to the river there is a fall of only four feet, and those drains only act as reservoirs of filth; you cannot possibly get them to drain themselves, and the only possible way of doing it is to keep the dirty water out. This portion of the Moonee Ponds channel would deliver direct into the end of the proposed canal, and would go out to sea by the Coode channel; but all the drainage slopes should be kept out, and dealt with separately. They can be dealt with even apart from the city area. In place of this present piece of works, there would be proper precipitation work on the Yarra, and my suggestion in this case will be to carry a sewer right along the Moonee Ponds channel, and along the western boundary of the railway reserve, and then deliver it through area tinted yellow, through purification works, into the Yarra.

1905. Would that fit in with the canal scheme?—Yes, and with any city scheme that would afterwards have to be developed, because each valley will have to be treated, in any future system of drainage, upon its own basis, and the Moonee Ponds Valley is independent altogether of the Yarra Valley till we come to its connection with the Yarra.

1906. Would the railway docks get any of the kitchen water, as you call it?—I would take all the filth out of it.

1907. In fact, all the work you propose, the sewerage of Melbourne and canals, and reclaiming of the Yarra from its present filthy state, would be properly the business of such a Board as is proposed as a Metropolitan Board of Works?—Of course the sewerage would be; and, if this scheme were carried out, it would be for them to do it, if this area were vested in the Board. At present it is in the hands of the Government.

1908. Do you consider the present condition of the Moonee Ponds Valley a serious matter?—I think certainly it is. Provided the filth is kept deep, comparatively little danger arises; but trouble may arise if the filth is cleaned out of it, and placed upon the bank and dries there. Under any gents of MELBOURNE EXTENSION.
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1939. That is the proposition, it implies that?—It would imply this, Mr. Chairman, that from the south building line of Bourke-street southward, the land would be taken from the present station-yard for the extension of the city, which means that the greater portion of that land would be that which is occupied for wood and timber yards now, and some of the goods sheds.

1940. And all the station here?—All the arrangement down here, yes; the station does not count for much, I think, for I understand this is only a temporary station, it is not a permanent one.

1941. But it is erected over the very spot where the permanent one is proposed to be erected; you are not aware of that, I suppose. It is proposed to erect a permanent station upon the present site, making the front the prolongation of Collins-street?—I was under the impression that for consequences of that site being so ineligible on account of its blocking the extension of the city that no final determination had been arrived at.

1942. How much land does your plan show could be rendered available for the extension of the city; how much land would you have to take away from the Railway Department?—I have prepared an estimate of the amount out of the railway land that is permanently dedicated to railway purposes, only 8 acres 1 road 24 perches; but of the temporary reserve 47 acres 1 road 6 perches, or a total of 55 acres 2 roads 30 perches.

1943. How much of that would be occupied by streets?—I have not taken that out because it is a suggestion, and may be altered, of course, in any way in which the requirements of the Department parting with the ground might determine.

1944. Can you show how much available frontage there would be?—Yes, according to the suggestions of this plan there would be an available frontage of 10,915 feet.

1945. For the purposes of sale?—Available for the purposes of sale, or such purposes as the proprietors might decide.

1946. You would have only one side of Bourke-street to part with?—Only one side.

1947. The two sides of all other streets, and one side of Flinders-street, is not that it?—There is land between the south side of the Flinders-street, and the back road to the wharf, which also might be sold.

1948. It is not proposed to sell that, is it. Does not that belong to the Trust?—I am not seized of that fact at all; I understand not.

1949. That includes the frontage also in the little streets extension?—Every frontage is not taken doubly, if I have measured a frontage to a main street I do not go and measure that frontage to a back street too.

1950. What is the distance between Little Flinders-street and Collins-street; does the allotment front both streets—have you only taken one frontage?—No, it is rather difficult to understand, because—

1951. Do you show rights-of-way?—Yes, there are forty feet lanes here in addition.

1952. That you do show frontages to the small streets, Little Flinders-street and Flinders-lane—you count them as streets?—Those are hardly little streets, those streets are a chain wide.

1953. What would be the width of the extended portion of Little Collins-street—is it the same as at present, or wider?—That is a chain wide.

1954. Little Collins-street is not a chain wide, is it?—The first portion of it is. I may explain myself more clearly perhaps to the Commission if I explain that the frontages are only measured upon streets that are of a chain or greater width.

1955. Not upon Little Flinders-street?—Little Flinders-street is made a chain wide, too.

1956. It is not a chain wide now?—No it is not, but that is my suggestion.

1957. And the result of that would be nearly 11,000 feet frontage of land to streets either a chain wide or more.—Yes.

1958. Did you take any levels at all?—Yes, levels all round here were carefully taken.

1959. What gradient did you find between the intersection of Collins and Spencer streets, and where would you terminate Collins-street?—Collins-street and Spencer-street?

1960. Between that and where you would terminate the extension of Collins-street?—There would be a difference of almost exactly 21 feet.

1961. Difference in level—what grade would that give?—The grade I worked out for the extension of Collins-street, from Spencer-street to the centre of the proposed line of viaduct, as shown here, is a grade of 1 in 45, which is quite a practicable grade, and that is based upon the supposition of leaving 14 feet clear headway under the girders of the viaduct.

1962. One in 45?—One in 45. I can give you all the gradients.

1963. Will you fix the position of the viaduct as proposed by Act of Parliament, or do you put it further back than the Act of Parliament defines?—I am not aware of where it is to be.

1964. How do you fix the locality of the viaduct?—That is laid down upon the plan arbitrarily as being a suitable position.

1965. You show it so?—Yes, I speak now of this plan.

1966. Then to get the grade of 1 in 45 involves putting the viaduct further back?—I cannot see that at all; I am not aware of any fixed position for the viaduct.

1967. It is already fixed by the Act of Parliament—you mean the viaduct connecting the two stations?—Yes, an elevated railway really.

1968. How far is the viaduct, according to your plan from the junction of Spencer-street with Collins-street?—To the centre of the viaduct is 900 feet.


1970. Then you put the viaduct ten chains further back than is already laid down?—I think I can explain it better by telling you the parallel distance from Spencer-street at which the curve of the viaduct starts—that is fourteen chains west of Spencer-street.

1971. The Act says it shall be constructed four chains west of Spencer-street—your plan puts it ten chains further back?—I was not aware of the Act.

1972. Of course, if the viaduct is placed where the Act of Parliament says it is to go, your grade of 1 in 45 is out of the calculation altogether?—I should not think it was difficult to alter an Act of Parliament if it is manifestly to the advantage of the public to do so.

1973. But, if the Act is carried out, your grade of 1 in 45 will not come?—Of course not.
1964. And what is the gradient between the prolongation of Bourke-street?—The prolongation of Bourke-street would be the most severe grade of the lot; that is, 1 in 57; but even that is a practicable grade.

1965. Do you show Latrobe-street produced across the swamp, too?—A line in prolongation of Latrobe-street is shown for a bridge, but I do not think myself that there would be any great practical advantage in it.

1966. Did you take any levels there?—No. The practicability of throwing a bridge over the line here rendered that unnecessary.

1967. You mean there would not be any practical advantage in the extension of Latrobe-street, if your suggestions were carried out?—No; I think the approach to the bridge would be very steep, and would be avoided by drivers; they are never very fond of taking horses over a railway bridge, and, in addition to that, they would have to go up a very steep ramp, a very long approach to reach the level of the bridge.

1968. You mean from the docks?—From any portion to the west of railway. The grade, as extended on plan, is 1 in 40 in Little Collins-street, 1 in 45 in Collins-street, and 1 in 197 in Little Flinders-street; those would be very easy.

1969. Of course, all that means that the viaduct is to go fourteen chains away from the intersection of Collins-street and Spencer-street?—Yes.

1970. Instead of 4 chains 14 links?—I really do not see how you are going to have a decent curve upon the viaduct if you take the four chains from Spencer-street without taking private property is got to Flinders-street.

1971. I think it was intended, it was supposed that it would involve the taking of private property?—

1972. You say that the curve would, in your opinion, be impracticable upon the viaduct if it were brought 4 chains 14 links from Spencer-street?—No; I have already, under the impression, looking at this plan, that drawing the viaduct line parallel to Spencer-street from that would involve your cutting off the corner of Spencer-street; but I see by the plan which has just been shown me by one of your officials that that is avoided. It is rather a sharp curve, I think.

1973. What is the radius of the viaduct as shown upon your plan?—Sixteen chains.

1974. Do you know what it is in the proposed viaduct?—No, it is not marked.

1975. Is it 12 chains?—It is a sharp curve than mine. I can see.

1976. At any rate, your proposal there would sweep away all the lower land south of the line of Bourke-street, would it not?—Yes, that is the idea.

1977. And place the station back at Bourke-street instead of at Collins-street, at the north side of Bourke-street, instead of the corner of Collins and Spencer-streets?—It means this, that, between Dudley-street and Bourke-street, there would be 30 acres of land left on which, of course, the Railway Commissioners could place their stations as they chose. I have not in any way to dictate anything in detail about the railway scheme. I imagine the railway engineers are able to do that themselves.

1978. Are you acquainted with any of the railways in Sydney?—I was five or six years surveying lines and exploring.

1979. Are you aware that the Sydney authorities are at present proposing to bring the station nearer to the city?—Yes, I prepared one of the designs myself.

1980. You see your present plan takes the station farther away?—Pardon me, the cases are hardly parallel, because, in bringing the railway to Sydney, you are bringing the railway through the heart of a populous city with established rights, and wherever a railway goes they must make ample provision for going from one side to the other side of the line wherever streets cross at present. The difficulty I see here at present is that caused by the presence of the railway yard; and the necessities of the railway department, I do not presume to speak at all; but, by the presence of the yard in this position, an absolute fence or wall is established which prevents the extension of this city in a westerly direction. It cannot extend easterly, the Public Buildings and Fitzroy Gardens prevent any extension there, and by the unfortunate circumstances that this railway yard goes down to the Yarra, all extension to the west is prevented.

1981. Suppose Flinders-street were extended and widened to, say, 200 feet, along the bank of the river, would not that be grand access to the railway and the docks?—That would be an improvement upon the present state of affairs.

1982. And also the extension of Latrobe-street, which would come butt upon the docks itself?—I think this plan shows the position of the dock, as proposed by Sir John Coode.

1983. You say the authorities in Sydney got this extension after a great amount of difficulty in regard to the rights of private persons?—Certainly, for every street cut through by the railway they have to provide either under or over bridges.

1984. Suppose we take your proposal to allocate a large portion of the land, and afterwards buy it back again, would you not be in a thousand times worse difficulty? Would not the department have to provide all those conveniences for the people whose land had to be bought back again?—On the assumption that the railway authorities received the amount in money that the sale of this land would yield for them, I do not see why they could not obtain a similar and equally suitable site in a less objectionable situation, as far as the interests of the city are concerned. It is the position of the site to which exception is taken.

1985. Can any sum of money be an equivalent for the loss of the station ground?—I do not think that any sum of money can be equivalent to what might interfere with the progress and expansion of a city like this.

1986. The Railway Commissioners, and the Chairman of the Commission, strenuously oppose any curtailment of this land, and say that all they can look forward to, if any of it is alienated, is that, in a few years' time, it would have all to be bought back. How would you meet an expression of the Chairman of the Railway Commission to that effect?—First of all I would say that I do not think (speaking with every respect to the Railway Commissioners) that it is wise to devote such a particularly valuable piece of ground as the 20 or 25 acres you have here merely to wood and timber lots while you might get equally suitable land elsewhere.

1987. Might not the very same argument apply to Fitzroy Gardens, that you look upon as an insuperable objection to the extension of the city eastwards?—I suppose you are far better aware than I am of the difficulty in getting the public to give up any public reserves.
1888. And quite right, too?—And I think so, too.

1899. That is an obstacle at the eastern end; is it not as great an obstacle as this at the western end?—I think that the fact that the whole of the business and commerce of the city is carried on at the west end is an insufficient answer to that argument. No commerce is carried on at the Flinders Gardens end of the city.

1900. There is another point in regard to your scheme which involves pushing the station back—would it not levy a heavier toll upon every ton of goods that had to be carted into the city for all time?—

1901. You know the street now where all the heavy traffic goes?—Flinders-street?

1902. Yes?—Yes.

1903. That would be further than Flinders-street, would it not?—I do not see that this scheme would in any way reduce the efficiency of Flinders-street. It is of its present width—a chain and a half.

1904. The Chairman means that the station is further away?—I do not see that that is anything.

1905. It would be the extra carriage from Latrobe-street to Flinders-street?—Yes.

1906. Have you measured the grade between Spencer-street and William-street in Collins-street?

1907. I have that. It is 1 in 25.

1908. Is it likely that heavy goods would ever be carted over a gradient of that sort?—It is too severe a gradient to be suited for heavy traffic. If it can be avoided.

1909. Flinders-street is almost level?—Yes.

1910. Would not it really take all the traffic?—I think Flinders-street is carrying nearly as much traffic as it can carry now. It appears to me by carrying everything into Flinders-street, you unnecessarily congest the traffic.

1911. It is proposed to widen it to over 200 feet wide?—That cannot affect it, at all events beyond William-street, I should think.

1912. Is not the gradient between King-street and William-street, in Bourke-street, equally steep with that of Collins-street?—I should think it was.

1913. No steeper?—I should not think so. I have not any knowledge of it. The steepest gradient I have had occasion to note in any street in this city is Collins-street. That is 1 in 15, except a piece in Stephen-street, which is 1 in 18, and practically useless for heavy traffic.

1914. Is not the gradient between Elizabeth-street and Queen-street, in Bourke-street, equally steep?—I think that is 1 in 18.

1915. I asked that question to see whether Bourke-street is not almost impracticable for heavy traffic?—Yes, it is.

1916. The new Princess Bridge is 99 feet wide, is it not?—Yes.

1917. And the new Falls Bridge is 99 feet also?—Yes.

1918. Say 200 feet, that width has to provide for the traffic between all the districts on one side of the Yarra, as against the districts on the other side?—Yes, and it concentrates the traffic for the length of the bridge. In Flinders-street you concentrate it for the length of the city.

1919. It is proposed to widen Flinders-street to 250 feet; Dudley-street is 100 feet wide, and Latrobe-street, if extended, another 100?—Dudley-street is a street where there is a bridge crossing under the railway: that, I think, practically, is very little use.

1920. I show you, last in those three ways you have 450 feet of road, as against the 290 feet of the Princess Bridge and Falls Bridge?—The gradient of Dudley-street, coming up to Spencer-street, is 1 in 19—one in nineteen and a quarter to be exact. I cannot speak with authority, but I think that if I were to go down and see the Dudley-street crossing is winter time, it would be all in a state of flood.

1921. Surely, if the Princess Bridge and the Falls Bridge are sufficient to accommodate the traffic between the north and south of the city, the enormous suburbs on both sides, 450 feet would be sufficient for Melbourne proper to the docks beyond?—You must always bear in mind that, in the case of the bridges, you are forced to concentrate the traffic, for the length of the bridge, as I said. Of course, I do not suppose you are prepared to deny that two more bridges would be a great advantage to the traffic across the river from north to south, or vice versa.

1922. A bridge can be erected at any time as long as there is a place to erect the abutments upon?—And means.

1923. You could extend all the streets upon bridges fifty years hence as well as to-day?—[No answer.]

1924. It has been stated by the Chairman that it is contemplated to widen Flinders-street, and also east of Spencer-street?—East of Spencer-street.

1925. With a viaduct coming along through the street, would you consider that suitable for traffic—a viaduct sufficiently wide to carry four roads of railway and to connect the Spencer-street station and the Flinders-street station?—There would be the obstruction to the street traffic of the uprivals necessary to carry the viaduct, even if it was constructed upon the system of the New York elevated railway; and this only applies to where the viaduct crosses Flinders-street.

1926. Would that not be a very cumbersome way of providing for the traffic?—I do not quite understand from you how far the proposal to widen Flinders-street is intended to extend.

1927. From the Falls Bridge westwards?—You appear to me to be pretty well pinched into the river before you get to the Falls Bridge.

1928. If the extension of those streets, as shown upon this plan, shows a grade of 1 in 37, by taking the viaduct more to the eastward than it is upon your plan, you could get a grade of 1 in 30?—Yes.

1929. Would you consider that would be a practically grade?—That would be a workable grade.

1930. So that the viaduct is put in the position now the worst that could happen to the station yard; it is put as much to the west now as it is necessary to put it to get the grade that you say of I in 37?—Yes.

1931. That is upon your plan?—Yes.

1932. You could not tell how much more to Spencer-street it would bring it to get a grade of 1 in 30?

1933. No, I could not tell without working it out. That would involve a little calculation.

1934. Are you satisfied that Flinders-street is sufficient, when the viaduct is erected in it, to take the traffic from the docks and also to the 'land laying west of the proposed docks'?—Upon the supposition that there is nothing else to help it but Dudley-street and Latrobe-street?
2023. Yes!—No, certainly I think it would not be sufficient.

2024. Are you aware that it is contemplated to bridge over the Yarra lower down than the proposed docks?—I think I heard of it a few days ago.

2025. That would be to take the traffic from the south of the river to that part of the extension of Flinders-street. That bridge would have that effect, if erected.—Possibly.

2026. That it would still add to the choke in Flinders-street?—Yes.

2027. Would it not relieve it, as traffic could go to the South Melbourne side?—Yes, after it has done its business in the city. Everything converges to the metropolis.

2028. It would go from north to south and from south to north.—Yes.

2029. Are you aware that when that viaduct has crossed Flinders-street there is a distance of 200 feet at least between the northern line of Flinders-street and the viaduct?—That is upon what?

2030. The railway plan?—No, I have not seen that.

2031. If that is correct, would there not then be plenty of room for the traffic?—If there is a distance of 200 feet from the viaduct and the present south line of Flinders-street?

2032. No, the present north line?—Of course, if that is the case, it would be so.

2033. May I ask if that is correct?—[The plea were produced and referred to by the Chairman.]

2034. The Chairman.—The measurement discloses three chains and a-half as the width, 2,812 feet; 31 feet more than Mr. Hodgkinson mentions.

2035. By the Commission.—That being the case, could the viaduct then interfere with the traffic?—Of course, if there is a clear space of 200 feet, you have the 200 feet available. I may mention in regard to the matter that I suppose you could not extend Flinders-street further down than Market-street. I think that is near the Falls Bridge. The grade of Market-street leading up from Flinders-street is 1 in 15.—[The witness handed in the plan which he first produced.]

2036. This street marked "Suggested approach to station," what does that mean?—That is the prolongation of the line of Bourke-street on a level with the present station and of the width of Bourke-street, which is left to enable a roadway approach to the station yard to be obtained, while Bourke-street is brought down to the level of 3 in 10 under the viaduct.

2037. That is placing the viaduct 14 chains from Spencer-street?—Yes.

2038. That street to the south of Bourke-street extension, what is that?—That is a street accessible right away to William's factory, and if extended through the factory, it might go on to the centre of the dock.

2039. These streets to the south are extensions of the present streets?—Yes.

2040. And those are the grades marked upon them?—Yes.

2041. You have a plan here?—I have prepared a plan here to the same scale as this plan, showing up to that line the actual extent of such a station as that of Cannon-street, London, to contrast the area of that with the still available amount of space that would be left, even if the portion south of Bourke-street were severed from the railway land as it is at present exists.

2042. Is there a similar class of traffic at Cannon-street?—[No answer.]

2043. Pardon me; this is for passenger traffic only; this is Cannon-street passenger station, is that so?—Yes, a first-class passenger station.

2044. What is the length of that station?—Seven hundred and fifty feet long by 200 feet wide, containing an area of 34 acres; you may say three acres and a-half.

2045. How many stations of that size could you build upon the land at the level of Spencer-street? You could build certainly three.

2046. Half-a-dozen, could not you?—Yes, but up to the railway line there is room for three.

2047. That space to the line of the viaduct is upon the level of Spencer-street?—Yes, 14 chains back from Spencer-street upon a level.

2048. Did you work that out?—Yes.

2049. What is it?—It represents an area of 1,200 feet long by 130 feet; a little more than three acres and a-half in area.

2050. Is it the same size as the present Bourke-street goods shed?—I think it is; rather larger.

2051. Place it upon the plan?—There is room for four or five such sheds here.

2052. Four or five goods sheds the same size as the brick shed is at present?—Yes.

2053. Have you seen the plan, if you please?—[The witness did see.]

2054. Those stations extend no further than Little Lonsdale-street?—No further north than Little Lonsdale-street.

2055. That leaves the whole of the land north of that available for railway purposes?—Yes.

2056. Have you been through the railway station yards here?—I have.

2057. Do you consider that they are fairly well laid out for railway purposes?—It struck me that they are not concentrated as well as they might be.

2058. The whole of the traffic, if concentrated in a station similar to that, and a second goods shed similar to that, could it, in your opinion, be done there?—I would hardly like to venture an opinion upon that, because I am not thoroughly conversant with the amount of traffic in the city. I am too short a time in Victoria to give an opinion upon that.

2059. The chief thing that troubled me when I inspected the yard was the appropriation of such a large amount of land upon that site to the purpose of timber and wood lots. I measured from the plan of the yard furnished to our office from the Railway Commissioners, and I find that from 20 to 22 acres at the least must be appropriated to that purpose.

2060. That represents the stations that you say?—Yes.

2061. You have heard it said, that the line of viaduct as proposed in the Bill for the construction of viaducts, is some 200 feet south from the south side of Flinders-street?—I have heard that stated.

2062. Since you came into the room?—Yes.

2063. What distance is the river from the south side of Flinders-street?—That only gives about 70 feet.

2064. Seventy feet from the south side of Flinders-street to the wharf upon the river?—At what I think is called the swing-lasov.

2065. And if the breadth of the wharf is taken off it, the space will be still narrower?—Yes.

2066. Mr. Borrows.—Is that correct?

2067. Mr. Coin.—That is from the Harbour Trust plan.
2065. Mr. Barrowes. — Is it correct that there is that discrepancy between that plan and the railway plan?

2066. By the Commission (to the witness). — If the statement is that the street can be made 200 feet wide, it does not apply beyond that point? — I cannot do.

2067. What is the width of Flinders-street there? — Mr. Cain. — Ninety-nine feet.

2068. The Chairman. — And 70.

2069. Mr. Cain. — Seventy includes up to the quay, but the timber wharf and the horse track along that wharf comes off that. (To the witness.). — Will you continue the line of Flinders-street 99 feet along?

— Yes.

2070. Then, before Flinders-street arrives at William-street, there is only 70 feet between the south side of it, and 99 feet wide, and the edge of the wharf — the outer edge of the wharf? — Yes.

2071. Mr. Hodgkinson. — Allow me to say that that is incorrect. I measured it from a correct plan of the Harbour Trust. It is 150 feet.

2072. Mr. Cain. — Pardon me, Mr. Hodgkinson, that may mislead. This plan was copied by an officer of the City Council from the Harbour Trust plan within a very short time.

2073. Mr. Hodgkinson. — You must remember we are making alterations there. This plan that I have is my hand, which I can show to you, is our most recent plan, showing all the improvements we have made in the wharf. What we have made are in one colour, and what we contemplate is another.

2074. Mr. Cain. — Then I will ask to have that plan measured. From the south side of Flinders-street to the edge of the wharf how much upon the plan?

2075. Mr. Hodgkinson. — Fifty-one feet.

2076. Then how is it possible to widen Flinders-street to 200 feet, if there is only 50 feet between the wharf and the south side of it at present? — (The witness). — I do not see how it can be done.

2077. Does not that necessitate, then, the whole of the traffic being brought from the west being choked into Flinders-street at that particular point — 99 feet? — Yes.

2078. Are you aware that the Harbour Trust are asking to have that basin widened further than they are now? — I am not aware of it.

2079. It was before your time; but the Harbour Trust, I may say, applied to the City Council for permission to widen the basin nearly to the edge of Flinders-street, to decrease the 50 feet that there is now? — I have already given evidence to the Chairman that I do not see how Flinders-street can be widened throughout anything like its entire length.

2080. Did you hear a remark, made by Mr. Hodgkinson, that the land at the south of the extension of Flinders-street belonged to the Harbour Trust? — Yes.

2081. That is the piece referred to? — I presume so.

2082. Does that belong to the Harbour Trust according to the plans submitted to you? — No; I have a plan here, obtained from the Government, I think — [referring to a plan].

2083. Mr. Cain. — It is a misapprehension that I want to remove. (Mr. Hodgkinson). — You said that when Flinders-street would be extended it would be so wide. The south was land in the possession of the Harbour Trust; that is the line at present leading down to the wharf, and, as I understood the plans, that is the Harbour Trust boundary to the north; so that this piece of land, coloured pink, would be taken from the present railway reserve? — (The witness). — Yes; nearly all that is included in the present temporary reserve.

2084. And the part you refer to is the nearest part to the northern edge of the swinging-basin? — Yes.

2085. Then if the swinging-basin is extended to the south instead, there is no difficulty in widening the street there? — No, none at all.

2086. Have you the measurements of the land of the main streets? — They are all fronting the main streets.

2087. You have not measured any frontage to the narrow streets? — No.

2088. You have measured the frontage on to the street facing the proposed viaduct? — Yes.

2089. And you have measured upon the proposed line of railway leading to a lower level? — I have not measured any of the frontages a second time; the back frontages are not considered.

2090. You have seen the land indicated by yellow tint upon the plans handed to each member of the Commission? — No, I have seen nothing that has been handed in to this Commission. I think I have a plan that shows those boundaries.

2091. With regard to that portion of Crown lands indicated by yellow tints upon those plans, are not your proposed extensions of streets virtually cut-de-sac? With regard to giving access to that land, would not the extensions of Latrobe-street give access to the land far better; in fact, access that your plans do not? — For such purpose as that, a bridge at Latrobe-street, no doubt, would be of great value, but it does not necessarily prove that this large area would be all receiving the heavy traffic that the dock work would necessitate.

2092. The extension of the city you propose is merely that portion between Spencer-street and the docks, and with regard to the extension of the docks outward. The docks themselves would be quite as great an obstruction as the railway land, would they not? — You refer to the proposed extension south of the southern portion of Bourke-street?

2093. Say in the sense with regard to giving access to the lands coloured yellow? — It does not come directly into connexion with the West Melbourne Lagoon, because the docks lie between, of course.

2094. Whereas the extension of Latrobe-street would give access? — A more direct access; the North Melbourne railway bridge would also come very close to the neighbourhood, and Dudley-street on the other side, such as it is.

2095. Assuming that you wished to come from that portion of the dock trust land, the north side of it being Dudley-street to Collins-street, or to the Post-office, say to Collins-street, would it be any shorter to go by Dudley-street or to go by Latrobe-street than it would be to come down to the east of the docks along the docks quay, and pass up Collins-street to that point? — I think the advantage in the grade would make matters generally prefer the latter road which you name.

2096. The road along the east side of the docks to Collins-street? — Yes.
2099. In fact they are a series of right angles all the way to any particular point in the centre of the city?—Yes.

2100. And it makes no difference whether you make the right angle down here or up to the north?—Exactly.

2101. The distance would be practically the same?—Yes, and the gradients would be better that way.

2102. Would it be, when you say the worst gradient of the one is 1 in 22, while the worst gradient of the other is 1 in 40; it would seem that the line where the best gradient is would be the most used?—I am not aware that I gave any gradients in Latrobe-street at all.

2103. Several of us know what is the worst gradient in Latrobe-street?—I think you will find I am correct in 40. Is that the street as it exists now?

2104. As it exists now, rising from Spencer-street?—Or are you taking into account the rise that the cars would have to make to get to the bridge over the railway?

2105. Take it altogether.

2106. Mr. Stewart.—Do you mean the street as it exists now, or when extended?—

2107. Mr. Hodgkinson.—What I meant is, that Latrobe-street, as it exists, has steeper gradients than Collins-street, as it exists between Spencer and William streets?—The street?—But Latrobe-street, as it exists, is not approachable; from the west side of the railway you have to get up to a bridge which will cross over all the railway land to Adderley-street, and if you want a grade of 1 in 45, you would have to go a long way upon the dock property to get that ascent.

2108. You have so knowledge yourself at all about railway requirements, I presume—no special knowledge about railway requirements in the station?—No, I do not pretend to have.

2109. Then if the Railway Commissioners say that this land which you mark off in streets for sale is indispensably necessary to the working of this railway station, you would not combat that opinion in any way whatever, I presume?—I would say it was a very unfortunate thing that the Railway Commissioners decided upon that particular site as the only site that would be suitable for their work.

2110. But you would not set your opinion against theirs in regard to the requirements of the railway station?—As I said before, I am too near an arrival here to venture an opinion in regard to their requirements. I have not heard anything in regard to the idea that the Railway Department have too much land, or anything of that sort. The idea is that portion of their land absolutely prevents the necessary extension of the city.

2111. The principal view you have taken all through is the ease of a portion of the land?—Not at all, no sale at all.

2112. Or the disposal of it from railway purposes with a view to the extension of the city westward?—No, I have only been endeavouring to show the feasibility of the scheme, and the sale of land I only mentioned in order to show that an alteration might be effected without costing the Railway Department so much money as they might otherwise feel would be the case.

2113. Then what was the primary object of your making this plan; was it to show that the city of Melbourne might be extended westwards without detriment to the railway grounds?—Yes.

2114. Or was it to give access to the docks?—Both reasons weighed with me.

2115. But which was the primary reason?—I should say giving access to the western district generally, especially the docks.

2116. Your plan does not show any of the land further back than this extension of the streets at all?—I have a sketch.

2117. Is that your ultimate plan; that when the streets are extended as far as that, you can go no further?—No; I have a lithograph here which shows the area available for sale, supposing the West Melbourne Swamp as it is known—

2118. That is all you have been instructed by the committee of the council to do?—That is all; but I may state that for my own information I have prepared an estimate of the available quantity of land that those would be for sale if the West Melbourne Swamp, oragoon, were cut out and sold.

2119. And would the streets shown upon that plan work in with the streets further back that might be cut out of the present railway land and the Crown lands beyond?—The Latrobe-street bridge, if it were constructed, and Dudley-street; certainly part of that land which his Worship has just pointed out, being part of the railway temporary reserve of 150 acres, and the extension of Collins-street, would be also valuable additions.

2120. Do you remember a deputation going from the City Council to the Mayor about this matter?—I do not remember anything of the sort.

2121. It was four or five months ago?—I have been here since the 1st of January.

2122. Is this the first plan which has been prepared by the City Council for this extension?—That is the only authorized plan.

2123. You know of no other plan in your office at all?—No.

2124. You did not take this plan from any pre-existing plan?—No, it was prepared from one or two sketches I made.

2125. So that when the deputation went to ask for this extension they went without any plan at all, or any levels?—I cannot say; I am not cognisant of it at all.

2126. Mr. Coin.—The general plan of the railways was in their possession—the plan before you; that shows the levels.

2127. By the Commission.—You referred to the Cannon-street station; is that the only railway station in London?—No. It is only one of a great many. It is one of the largest, and I suppose St. Pancras is a little larger in area; but Cannon-street is a first-class station, and one of the largest in London, doing an enormous business.

2128. No goods at all?—No, only passengers.

2129. No provision for carriages or engines?—No.

2130. No provision for carriages to run in?—No, only a city passenger station.

2131. Is it fair to make a comparison at all between the Cannon-street Station, a station owned, I understand, by a private company, and the terminus of the great national railway system of this solency, and, in effect, as we were told yesterday, of all the colonies?—I did not intend to make any comparison in that manner; I merely meant to give an idea of the space available, provided a portion of the present railway
property south of Bourke-street were lopped off. I wished to practically illustrate to the members of the Commission the space that still was remaining for station purposes, in comparison with the area that they had for a first-class passenger station at home, showing that there is so much more space left for other purposes. 2322. Must not huddling these stations so closely result in an enormous increase in the cost of management?—I think, when you consider that there will be, south of Dudley-street, still left about 80 acres, and that you have no provision to make for workshops, which, I understand, are being built at Newport, thus leaving only your passenger and goods station, 80 acres can hardly be called an area upon which a station is huddled. 2323. What about engine sheds and rolling-stock sheds?—[No answer.] 2324. Supposing that the railway station ground were reduced as proposed there, would not the bridge over Latrobe-street become a very serious impediment regarding signals, and so on?—Yes, I think it would; I am not at all favorably disposed to the Latrobe-street means of access, and that is why I speak so earnestly. I speak now entirely without any authority from my Committee, but I feel deeply the necessity for some opening to the south, the openings that the railway does give to the west, at Dudley-street, and the possibility of a bridge at Latrobe-street being so inadequate. 2325. But the danger is so increased by taking the whole of the traffic to Bourke-street, rather than taking part of it to Collis-street?—I am not understand. 2326. This would be a far greater impediment if Bourke-street were the furthest point south that the railways would come, than it would be if the railways were allowed to come to Collis-street?—That might possibly be so; but, I should think, not to an insuperable extent. 2327. Under the Act of 1855, you would have the right to build the railway in the line of Latrobe-street, but not the right to build the bridge over the railway in the line of Latrobe-street would be a very unsafe proceeding for working the traffic?—It would not be a thing that I would think very desirable. 2328. It would not add to the safety, at any rate?—No, for several reasons. 2329. Assuming it is close to the station?—It crosses the line. 2330. If it were a mile north of the station, that would not exist?—I do not know that the proximity of the station would be so objectionable as the continual passing of the trains, and the interference with the signal man. 2331. That is why I say, if it is far from the station the interference would not exist, but within a quarter of a mile the danger would be greater; it would intercept the view?—Yes. 2332. Then that objection would apply to any railway bridges, if it were decided to bridge over the line at Bourke or Collis streets?—I think the proposal 'to take a bridge over the line at Collis-street would be very objectionable. You could get so decent grades at all. 2343. Are you aware that there are bridges at many stations between here and Sandhurst, and semaphores worked from the stations?—I do not know the line from here to Sandhurst very well; but, of course, I know it is very probable that it is so. 2344. At Maldon, there is a bridge upon the line near the station, and the semaphore is worked from the station?—I know that, as a rule, especially with a long bridge like that over a busy station yard, many drivers would be reluctant to take their loads over, and the horses would be reluctant to cross it; many would not cross it on account of the screeching of the whistles, and the puffing of the locomotives. 2345. At Sandhurst there are bridges on both sides of the station over the line?—Yes, but I think this evil could be intensified in the ease of the Latrobe-street bridge.

The witness withdrew.


2346. By the Commission.—You see this plan?—Yes. 2347. I asked you to come yesterday to look at the grades?—Yes, I can see it. 2348. Would you consider all those extensions are practicable, leaving to one side the taking of the land from the railway authorities?—No, I would not. 2349. Leaving that out of the question—would you consider that those grades and the laying out of the street also another is a practicable scheme for grades?—For what? 2350. To load down to the docks and to the river extensions?—For what purpose, after they are finished? 2351. For the purpose of streets to lead to the docks and to the extension of the river?—Exactly; but what is the good of them after they have led to the docks, who will use them? 2352. Those that have business, I assume?—You have got the permanent levels of the streets now that you cannot get over. If you go into Collis-street from the docks, I do not care how, but supposing you got there on the railway, Spencer-street, or Bourke-street, or Latrobe-street, you have still the permanent levels of the streets to deal with, that are objectionable from a heavy traffic point of view. 2353. What grade do you consider is objectionable?—I think the one between King-street and William-street, for instance, objectionable. 2354. In Collis-street?—Yes; I should say that must be about 1 in 25, or something like that. I think that a very objectionable grade for heavy traffic. 2355. But that is used daily by heavy traffic?—Very little goes there, they go to Flinders-street, and they will still go to Flinders-street if you make forty streets. 2356. But this extension to the east of Spencer-street cannot be altered. But those grades, in your opinion, workable grades?—They are as workable grades as in the other streets; but those streets are not used now, nobody uses those streets that can get into Flinders-street; if you go into Flinders-street in the morning, you see the whole traffic of the city going into Flinders-street, and not into any other streets. 2357. But if Flinders-street is not sufficiently wide?—How then can you prevent their going there; are they to toss up who is to go into Flinders-street and who is not—how will you do it? 2358. It was shown by the city officers that Flinders-street cannot take much more traffic than is there at present?—I think you could treble the traffic easily. I do not know, upon that plan, how you would get your traffic, and of course that wipes out this station altogether, takes it entirely away. You
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take it away, and practically make North Melbourne the Melbourne station, because that 750-foot station would not do here; it may do in Cannon-street, but it would not do here.

2159. But there is room for about four of those stations?—It does not matter if there is half-a-dozen; you want it in length. When I laid down the stations here, I think, 1,350 or 1,400 feet, Mr. Higginbotham thought they were too long, and he commenced to take them up, but he had to put them down again.

2160. Do you consider the traffic of Melbourne at present greater than at Cannon-street?—I do not know what goes out of Cannon-street, but I know that the traffic in Melbourne, more especially on certain occasions, such, for instance, as Cup Day, requires that you shall be able to start three trains from your station without clashing at each platform, and you could not work three trains—you could not work two trains—in the length you have got there now. You have to work three trains here; one train can arrive, an empty, and be pushed into its place; two others can be got ready to start as loaded trains, and none of them clash.

2161. Then the summing up of it is that there is a bigger and more troublesome traffic done in Melbourne than is done in Cannon-street?—I do not know what they do in Cannon-street; I know what is done here.

2162. If they can do it in Cannon-street, they can do it here?—I do not know what they can do there, but I know that there is no such traffic in Cannon-street as there is here; they have short trains, I expect, and do not cut up their trains. I imagine it is more like Flinders-street station, where you just round your train and get the engine in front again, altogether a different state of things; there is no comparison between them at all, none; it will not stand any comparison. Ask any railway man who has the responsibility of carrying the thing out. You can get as many amateur plans as you can shake a stick at.

2163. Would you call Cannon-street station plan an amateur plan?—Not as far as Cannon-street is concerned; but that is not saying that because a plan will do there it will do here, where the conditions are altogether different.

2164. If St. Pancras station plan were laid down, would you consider that altogether an amateur plan?—I do not care what station it is; I know that the conditions are entirely different from what they are here.

2165. Do you consider the central station in New York applicable?—I do not care for any station; I know what the traffic is here. I have seen the traffic at its worst times; I have seen the traffic at times when every bit of the whole of the platforms was full. In fact there ought to be three more platforms; those were only a portion of the plan. The works have never been carried out yet, and I have seen every bit of those platforms occupied.

2166. Have you ever been in a large railway station?—I think so, one or two.

2167. Name one?—Pretty well all over Europe, in some parts of America, and a good deal in India.

2168. At what date?—All sorts of dates.

2169. How long ago?—Nothing less than a hundred years ago.

2170. Have you seen any of the large London stations—the modern stations—Cannon-street, St. Pancras, or Euston-square?—I have not. I have seen the drawings of them.

2171. Have you seen the New York Central Station?—No, I have not; but I know that those private companies that have stations all had to pay an enormous sum for their land; and as a previous witness stated, everything has to be taken away out of the station and done away from the station. They have to pay an enormous sum for their land, and if you were to ask them if they would like more land for a station, you would soon see whether they would have a 3 1/2 acres station or not; they are compelled there, on account of the enormous price of land, to do with as little room as they possibly can.

2172. You heard the witnesses who preceded you?—Yes.

2173. The Chairman to Mr. Cain.—This plan, I presume, may be taken as the plan of the City Council, Mr. Cain?—Yes.

2174. Mr. Cain.—Yes, the plan is approved of by the committee.

2175. By the Commission (to the witness) What do you think of the plan, Mr. Woods?—I think it would be just as well to take the station land altogether, and let the railway people contrive how they can get out of it. If you are going to take the land from them, I think it is hardly the thing to take the land, and then say, "We will give you the plan, and tell you how to work." If they have the responsibility of working the station, they ought to have the planning of the station. That is my idea of it—that is, simply taking the land; it is perfectly gratuitous to tell them how to work it. I would not look at the plan for my own part, if I had anything to do with the business. I would say, "If you are powerful enough to take the land, take it, and we will do the best we can."

2176. Has not there been a very general complaint by the large railway companies in England that they have too little land instead of too much?—Always that; it is the enormous cost of the land that restricts them to what they are, and that puts the companies to great extra expense; they can simply run a train or two in, and a train or two out again—it is like going in at the neck of a bottle, and out again at the neck of a bottle, just the same.

2177. You heard Mr. Mountain's evidence about the wood depot?—Yes.

2178. You would not suppose, for a moment, that it is intended for all time to keep that land occupied for that purpose?—I do not know. The land is occupied for a very good purpose; it is freight that comes by train, and where you find accommodation for wool and wheat and goods of other sorts (of course they are at a different rate), you want accommodation for that, so that I do not see that you could put the land to a much better purpose.

2179. Then I gather that the sum of your evidence in regard to the alienation of any of the station land is that the requirements of this railway station, as the terminus of the national system, is an unknown quantity, and it would be unwise therefore to part with any of the land at present unoccupied?—Yes. That is better expressed than I could express it myself, but it gives my views exactly; and I may say, that I do think that the land run over by engines and covered with rails (I suppose there are 100 miles of rails in this station yard), put nationally—I do not say from a city point of view, but nationally—is put to quite as good a purpose as it could be, say, in baby linen stores, or oyster shops, or anything of that sort.
2180. If the land was sold, and realised a million in money?—Who would get the million of money? My constituents up yonder would get no portion of it; it would be an extra charge upon them inevitably, and upon the whole of the country districts—they would have to pay for any extra charge this place is put to, and the simpler you can make it, or the more space you can give them, the better. I should like some gentleman who thinks he knows anything about railway business, to come here on some Tuesday night, at ten or eleven o'clock, and stand there and see the trains being made up for the country; but he had better take some one with him that can prevent his neck being broken. He will not want anyone to tell him where room is wanted; they have to run back to Dudley-street to get to some of the crossings in consequence of this one solitary shed being out of line.

2181. Who manages that work in the yard?—I do not know.

2182. Where is the chief man?—Mr. Saddler, I think.

2183. If Mr. Saddler were to say that the business could be carried on better if the station was moved north of Bourke-street, would you put any reliance upon it?—Not at all.

2184. Though he is the chief man that works this traffic?—Not at all; I know it as well as he does or anyone else.

2185. If he says he could work the traffic much simpler, and safer, and cheaper by moving the station to the north of Bourke-street—upon a proper plan—would you pay any attention to it?—I should certainly hear with very great interest anything that Mr. Saddler could suggest, but I should have to hear it from Mr. Saddler himself, and hear his reasons for it, and see a plan. Meanwhile, I see that that plan here involves curves to the left.

2186. The City Surveyor definitely states that he puts forward no plan of the station yard?—No, but you have a narrow bit of land, the viaduct running right through. It is not in elevation, or we could see what the headway is, and so on; but I understand from it that it is the plan of a viaduct crossing those streets, and that the station is run back to the point you have shown it at—750 feet.

2187. No, that is moveable?—In order to do that you have to make a curve to the left. Now, this station was altered on account of the curves to the right in order to get a straight line from North Melbourne into Melbourne, and if you stand at the new goods shed end, you see there is a perfectly straight line from North Melbourne station, and it is a great advantage where trains are coming in, as the numerous goods trains from different parts of the country do, upon six or seven lines. With passenger trains coming and going it is a great advantage at any rate, notwithstanding all the signals you have got, to be able to see trains approaching and trains leaving, and for that reason that running shed ought to have been swept out of the way long ago. It has been the cause of a great deal of trouble and expense. I suppose it will be shifted some time; but the main object of straightening the lines was to see from the platform right to North Melbourne.

2188. Well, you see that as it is proposed to be built?—Yes.

2189. With all the curves?—Those curves will be all taken away as soon as the running shed is taken away.

2190. Where is it proposed to build the new passenger station?—I do not know; but I proposed to build it over those three platforms.

2191. How many chains is it from Spencer-street?—I do not know.

2192. But the curves are in the line now from North Melbourne?—Those curves are in consequence of the running shed being in the way; as soon as it is out of the way the lines can be straightened.

2193. But the site of the straight road from North Melbourne, as you suggest and propose—how many chains is it from Spencer-street?—What part of it?

2194. From Spencer-street?—It runs, not parallel with Spencer-street, but at an acute angle to Spencer-street.

2195. As I understand the yard, the line, of what was put up as a temporary grain shed is upon the straight road?—It is at present all but on the straight road, because it is narrowed at North Melbourne.

2196. How many chains is that from Spencer-street?—I do not know. I cannot tell from recollection.

2197. It is upon the plan?—I should say about seven chains. I do not know, but speaking from memory, I should say about seven chains—[The Chairman referred to the plan].

2198. It is ten chains and a-half at Collins-street the straight road from Spencer-street?—Ten chains and a-half to the centre of the shed.

2199. Yes, to the centre of the straight road?—The corrugated iron shed.

2200. Yes?—Then the passenger station would be outside of that.

2201. So that those fourteen chains, the line of this viaduct, would not be very far out of the line of the straight road?—No, that would be upon the low-lying lands, pretty well upon the wood sidings.

2202. Upon the edge?—Upon the edge.

2203. Upon the edge of the high ground?—That is quite right; that would cut all that off, and as for good sheds I do not know where you would put them.

2204. The near edge of that shed has just been measured at less than eight and a-half chains?—From Collins-street?

2205. Yes?—I thought so.

2206. It has been said that about two-thirds of the traffic of the colony comes into this station, that is not speaking of Adelaide or anywhere else; do you think that is about right?—I do not think it is an over estimate; but in a very short time, when the lines are all connected from Queensland and from South Australia, it will exceed it very considerably, no doubt about it. Spencer-street station is the place where you have got a very great deal of room, and you want a very great deal of room for the growing traffic of the lines. The traffic has grown here during the last seven or eight years at a rate that no man could calculate before.

2207. More than a hundred per cent.?—I dare say; but, at all events, no one could calculate the increase, I am quite satisfied about that.

2208. From your knowledge of railways, would it not be a great injustice to the rest of the colony, to run back the station half a mile?—I do think so. I object to it on that ground, apart from objecting to it from the railway point of view. I object to it as representing the people of the colony who will have
to pay for it; and I know my constituents would never receive any advantage from it, whatever amount of money was got from the sale of the land.

2209. And it would be a tax upon them for ever afterwards?—And it would be a tax upon them for ever afterwards.

2210. The city make nothing out of it?—I would take very good care they did not, if I had anything to do with it.

2211. You think the city is not the whole colony?—Certainly not.

The witness withdrew.

Robert Wetherpoon examined.

2212. By the Commission.—What are you?—A civil engineer.

2213. Have you been connected with the railway department here?—I have been connected with railways in South Australia and New South Wales for the past six years.

2214. How long have you been in this colony?—A year at the present time, and one year before.

2215. Do you know anything at all about the Victorian Railways system?—Not particularly.

2216. Do you know Spencer-street station?—Yes, I know it pretty well.

2217. Do you know how much land is occupied by the station?—I calculated quantities for the station yard, which are in Mr. Mountain's possession.

2218. Did you prepare Mr. Mountain's plan?—Yes, I prepared that plan according to instructions.

2219. Where did you get the plan to copy from?—It was compiled from the Harbour Trust Government plans.

2220. You made those calculations as to the number of frontages and all that?—Yes.

2221. Did you take any of the levels?—I did not take the levels myself; but I am satisfied the levels are correct.

2222. How did you come to place the viaduct in that position?—It is a matter of arrangement. I believe it would suit the station.

2223. Do you know the viaduct is to be built in another place altogether?—I do not.

2224. Was the viaduct placed in that position in order to show a gradient of 1 in 45?—No, the viaduct could be altered, and still have a workable grade for the streets.

2225. Brought closer?—Yes.

2226. Suppose you bring it four or five chains closer?—That would not do to maintain the present level of Spencer-street; it would be too steep.

2227. It is proposed to build it four chains fifteen links from Spencer-street?—Then the grade would be too steep.

2228. Then, if that position of the viaduct is to be adhered to, four chains fifteen links from Spencer-street, the grades of your streets would be impracticable?—Yes, they would be too steep—grades that is maintaining the level of Spencer-street.

2229. Did you examine Latrobe-street?—Yes, I know Latrobe-street.

2230. You do not take that into account on your plan at all?—Yes, it is extended upon that plan right over to the docks; but so levels were taken; but it could be put there. You could see that without taking levels it is not wanted.

2231. Would the levels be as favourable as those on the other part of the plan?—You would have a grade of 1 in 30 to the land occupied by the docks.

2232. You know Flinders-street?—Yes.

2233. Take a man with a lorry full of goods, and starting from the docks, which street would he choose, supposing all those streets were open, Latrobe-street as well, and Flinders-street widened?—Certainly, he would not go Latrobe-street, he would go the easiest route.

2234. Which do you think is the easiest route?—The level road.

2235. Flinders-street?—Yes, round by Flinders-street, provided that street be adequate to receive the increased traffic.

2236. You have had considerable experience in railway station yards?—Yes, I was connected with the Caldeonian Railway in the old country, and a good many stations in this country; in constructing station yards in connexion with railways.

2237. You think that the laying out of a station yard, or the planning of a station, upon that plan as shown of the Cameron-street Station, could be carried out on this ground?—Yes, I believe a station could be put upon this ground.

2238. Do you know the large railway stations in England or Scotland?—The only one I know well is Buchanan-street, Glasgow; I do not know its area.

2239. Is it a large area?—Yes.

2240. As large a traffic in that station as is doing in the Melbourne station?—Yes, I am satisfied there is.

2241. If a station was provided in Melbourne as large as that for the present traffic of Melbourne, it would be quite sufficient?—Quite sufficient.

2242. You do not know the area of that station?—I cannot say just now; but by comparison, I believe, the one could be made as good as the other.

2243. You can guarantee all the levels and grades to be correct?—They are all perfectly correct.

2244. Have you any knowledge of the value of the land adjoining the railway station at Glasgow?—Not now. It is seven or eight years since I was there.

2245. Even at that time, do you know the value?—No, I was not particularly acquainted with the value of land there.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Thursday, 12th May, at Two o'clock.
THURSDAY, 12th MAY, 1887.

Present:

The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.I.A., in the Chair;

The Hon. J. A. Wallace, M.L.C.,
N. Thornley, M.L.C.,
F. T. Sargood, M.L.C.,
W. Madden, M.L.A.,
W. Anderson, Esq., M.L.A.,
G. Cooper, Esq., M.L.A.,
J. Larenas, Esq., M.L.A.

D. M. Davies, Esq., M.L.A.,
J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.L.A.,
P. Wright, Esq., M.L.A.,
W. Cain, Esq.,
J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
C. Hodgkinson, Esq.,
A. J. Swayne, Esq.

Orlando Fenwick, Esq., examined.

2246. You have been a councillor of the city of Melbourne for a very long time?—Yes, some twenty years.

2247. And been connected very largely with the west end of the city?—Yes, for thirty years.

2248. You were also mayor of the city?—Yes, some fifteen or sixteen years ago.

2249. Was there any proposal mooted during that time as to the extension of the city?—Yes, there was. There was a Royal Commission appointed to consider the question of better approaches to the city, and to deal with the noxious trades and the general improvement of the West Melbourne swamp. Very important evidence was given before that commission by engineers, showing the advisability and practicability of extending West Melbourne.

2250. What was that?—Fifteen years ago. I was chairman of the commission; it was called the Low Lying Lands Commission.

2251. Did that deal with the extension of the city?—It dealt with the noxious trades and the approaches to Melbourne.

2252. Approaches from where?—I suppose from the Bay. That was the title of the commission, and there were a number of engineers summoned to give evidence, and, as I have said, they gave very important evidence as to the practicability and advisability of extending the city; and one idea was to extend Collins-street down to the docks.

2253. Were the docks even thought of then?—Yes, the present Harbour Trust is the outcome of that very commission you are now asking about.

2254. Did your commission suggest the locality of the new cut, for instance?—Yes, that was one of the things considered. On that point the commission was divided; one half were for making a straight cut into the Bay and the other half for making a loop there to take the Fisherman’s Bend off the same as by Coode’s plan.

2255. What was decided about the railway station?—That did not come up, but several engineers were examined, and they distinctly stated the advisability of extending Collins-street, and carrying La Trobe-street over the railway, and Dudley-street under. At that time Bourke-street was not thought of; but I would only say, if it was advisable then to do what I have mentioned, how much more is it now, when Melbourne has extended some two or three miles, making the station still further away from the centre of population. It has extended three or four miles in the direction of North Fitzroy and Carlton, beyond the city, I maintain that two-thirds more people sleep north of La Trobe-street than south of it.

2256. How does that affect the question of the railway station?—If you wish to have the railway in a central position now, and I maintain that it would be more central if even Lonsdale-street were proposed than Collins-street or Bourke-street. As I say, the greater part of the population are north, and it is more central for all the streets. The north part of the town has extended two miles, whereas it has not extended an inch south of the Yarra; but I want to point out to one gentleman who gave evidence before you as against the extension of West Melbourne, who stated that in Paris, or somewhere on the Continent, they had paid eight millions of money to take the railway into the centre of the city. Now, I maintain that by extending West Melbourne you put the railway in a more central position, and, instead of spending eight millions of money, you will save money. I have calculated it, and have been careful through it all, and I think it would be worth more than a million of money. I say that by extending West Melbourne you make the railway central, because the population is there now, and none south, and, instead of paying eight millions for the ground, you sell land which, I estimate, is worth over a million of money.

2257. You say the tendency is for population to increase in a northern direction?—Yes.

2258. And that will continue, you think?—Yes, most decidedly.

2259. Then in another fifteen years we will have to go back another half-mile?—The outer circle line, which was, in my opinion, the most sensible line that was ever projected, would have connected all the railways outside Melbourne.

2260. But according to you, the centre is always shifting further north?—No, I do not say that. Of course there is a limit. I maintain that, in regard to the outer circle line, the passenger station was intended to be in Lonsdale-street, and a very suitable place for a goods station was to be where the old cattle yards were, in the north of Elizabeth-street. That was Mr. Higinbotham’s scheme, and I think it was the best projected yet.

2261. That report you referred to is in print?—Yes, it can be got.

2262. That report was never acted upon in any point?—I do not know about that; but, of course, commissions are generally appointed not to do a thing. But, anyhow, the Harbour Trust was the outcome of that commission, so that they did that much good.

2263. Have you considered this contingency, that placing the station further away from the business centre of Melbourne would make a heavier charge on the cartage of goods coming into the colony or goods going out?—That is one of the best reasons, I think, for altering the station. If the docks are placed where it is proposed. All the Victorian world is in favour of intercolonial free-trade. Now, I maintain that the greatest bar to intercolonial free-trade is the enormous cost of first bringing the stuff up the Yarra for 5s., and then paying 2s. for cartage, and if you re-ship to a neighbouring colony, that cost is repeated, making 14s. for carrying the goods three or four miles, while they would not have cost more than the 14s. to bring them
fourteen or fifteen thousand miles, all the way from England; whereas, if the Government built bonded stores in the immediate neighbourhood of the docks, and kept them in their own hands, the whole of the stuff could be swung from the ship into the bonded stores, and sent to any part of the world. If we want to make this place the emporium of this side of the world, it cannot be done as things are at present, with the boats scattered all over the city at an enormous cost to the country. Now, if a man has to get a few packages out of bond, he has to employ a landing waiter, or whatever the officer is called; whereas, if it was all down in the neighbourhood of the docks, half the custom house officers would do, and more supervision would take place. Besides, there would be an immense income if the Government would keep those bonded stores in their own hands, and have a perfect control of the stores. In that case a large merchant could have a store all to himself, and another, not so large, could have a flat, and the rest just have their goods stored there. That alone would bring an immense revenue with rising trade such as we have here, and the rest of the land in the line of the streets would be sold; but I might just say, as regards the selling of that land, I notice you generally say you must go over or under the railway; if you do that you depreciate the value of that land one half; you must push the railway back; in the other way you create an obstacle or a difficulty to go over or under.

2964. Every witness examined by us who has any responsibility to face with regard to dealing with the railway system, says that it would be very bad policy—suicidal—to part with any of the railway land which is now in such an advantageous position for the mercantile and exporting interests of the country as well as of Melbourne; they say the land should not be parted with, and that the railway station, if interfered with at all, the streets, if any, should be carried over on a viaduct, and that the access to the docks could be best accomplished by widening the longest street we have in the city—Flinders-street. Now, seeing that that opinion has been expressed without variation by Railway Commissioners, ex-Ministers of Railways, and others, would you still set up your opinion against theirs, and say that they are wrong?—I would not say that they are wrong; but I maintain that I am right in what I say.

2965. You cannot both be right?—I do not know that.

2966. You say, sell the land; they say, keep it; that is diametrically opposite—I say, most decidedly, sell it; because you have any amount of land beyond. I have just heard read out the quantity of land round seven different stations round London, and you have about ten times that amount of land here.

2967. Those were passenger stations only?—But you have ten times more land here.

2968. It was said—was it true—that those railways at home were still circumscribed; I have no doubt it is true; but I have never seen them what they would like to have they would soon tell you, more?—My own feeling is—it is all a question of unearned increment—if this money was credited to the Railway Commissioners, a host of difficulties would soon disappear like snow before the sunshine, and they would then make the railways pay 25 per cent, with this million of money at their back, and they would get all the honor and glory of making the railways pay; it is only a question of bookkeeping, that may as well be credited to the railways, and the railway debentures would sell at a higher price, so there would be a benefit all round.

2969. The Chairman of the Railway Commissioners says that to sell or alienate this land would depreciate the value of the railways several millions sterling?—I have a very high opinion of Mr. Speight, but I believe in my own judgment, and if I was going to buy a piece of land, I would buy it on my own judgment in preference to Mr. Speight's, or anybody else's; but if you want to raise the railway on a viaduct, I maintain you do depreciate the value of the land. I have been over the land where it is kept for storing fifty or one hundred pounds' worth of old firewood, and I see no reason for a viaduct from Collins-street, where there is a good gradient, unless you mean to make a mountain over it. If I had the making of the thing, I would stop the railway on the north side of Lonsdale-street, in connexion with the outer circle line.

2970. You would still maintain that viaduct?—Yes, but I would push the railway over. I would not, as proposed, put it in the line of the streets and go over or under them. I heard Mr. Woods say once, when we were at Beaconsfield in that large country, it was to say that a railway shall go "from here to here," and that was the engineers' business to carry it out. That is pretty much my view. There is the proper place for the station, and it is the engineers' business to carry it out.

2971. You were asked whether docks were spoken of fifteen years ago, at the time of the Royal Commission. I asked you were they spoken of thirty-two years ago, when you first got an interest in property in West Melbourne?—I do not know about thirty years ago. Mr. Leaver, Mr. Laurans, and I belonged to the West Melbourne Improvement League, when we had intentions to extend the city westward.

2972. You said just now that you would be quite content to see the railway, in a sense, terminate at Lonsdale-street. I understand that that means that you would like to see all land intervening occupied for a different purpose than the present?—Yes, and the Crown get the money.

2973. Are you an importer of goods?—Yes.

2974. As an importer of goods, would you think that it would add any cost to your carting of goods, if the railway station were there?—It would be no disadvantage at all. The price of carriage is 2s. a load, and whether it is two hundred or three hundred yards one way or the other, it really makes no difference; but what I say is, that in that case you would save all that, and it is an unfair taxation of the people. Only fancy the whole of the working population has to pay 5s. extra per ton for everything that comes up the Bay and on to Melbourne. It is a reckless tax.

2975. Do you mean to say that if the station were pushed back either to Bourke-street, or further to Lonsdale-street, it would not increase the cost of carriage into the city?—Not one penny.

2976. Would it save anything of the last entirely, because I would have docks so as to swing the stuff off at once into the bonded stores adjoining. The 5s. would be done away with. It would make 1s. a ton difference to a merchant sending goods straight away to Sydney, Launceston, and other places beyond the colony.

2977. You said the proposal was for the station trending to the north?—Yes.

2978. You are speaking about South Melbourne and St. Kilda to push the line off from the railway station?—It would make very little difference to them, as between Collins and Bourke streets and Lonsdale street; but if you take a three penny ride on the Brunswick line of tram you will see that a city bigger than Melbourne has grown up, and then again there is an enormous population at North Carlton. The other
day the cemetery was in the bush; it is now surrounded with houses a great way beyond. The Reilly-street drain also was in the bush—it is built on thick on each side.

2275. As to the suggestion of the City Council to put the station back north of Bourke-street, do you think there would be additional cost either to consumers or to producers in bringing the main body of up-country produce to the city either for shipment or for consumption in Melbourne or the suburbs?—Not one penny to the consumers, and there would be a saving in shipping of 6s. a ton—you cannot get over facts.

2280. You are assuming the docks are there?—I am assuming that the docks and the bonds are there.

2281. I put my question mainly as to goods coming from the country, because it is supposed, right or wrong, that if the station was put back a little to the north it would materially enhance the cost of bringing up the country produce to the market—are you of that opinion?—It is a perfect absurdity to suppose that a hundred yards would make any difference—it is the handling and unloading does it—if it has to be put on a dray at all it does not matter whether it is fifty or a hundred yards—it is the handling of the goods, and in the case of cheap goods sometimes you pay five per cent. on the value every time you handle them.

2282. In regard to your valuation of the ground which would be taken away from the Commissioners as suggested by the City Council. How do you arrive at that value—is it on your own judgment?—Thoroughly on my own judgment; but I asked a leading auctioneer his opinion, and he was quite of opinion that it would realize the prices I put down, within twelve or eighteen months after the alterations were made.

My valuation brings it considerably over a million by the plans prepared by the corporation.

2283. Do you simply go by the large number of linear feet frontage in the plan submitted to us the other day?—Yes, I go entirely on that plan.

2284. In putting the station back north of Lonsdale-street, as you say, where would you propose to put the goods sheds for receiving goods from the country?—I merely mentioned that Mr. Higginbotham's scheme was to put the passenger accommodation in Lonsdale-street, and the goods at the top of North Melbourne avenue where the old cattle yards used to be. I mentioned that as a good scheme.

2285. That is not practicable now?—No.

2286. Your opinion is that there is plenty of room for a passenger station put north of Lonsdale-street?—Yes.

2287. Now, as to the goods sheds, where would you put them?—There are a hundred and odd acres now west of Lonsdale-street in possession of the Crown.

2288. That is the swamp?—Yes.

2289. In putting down the goods in the swamp, that would put them away from the city; how much further than where they are now?—I should think a quarter or half-a-mile.

2290. Following that up, I am anxious to ascertain what you propose as to getting goods into the various parts of the city from the goods sheds?—Before you ask any more questions on that, I may say that the goods sheds, I take it, would be round the docks.

2291. That is ship goods?—Will not that be the great goods station for everything?

2292. You cannot build on the same site for all?—There is room enough for all. The produce from the country must go to those docks, because you want to ship it.

2293. But there must be goods sheds somewhere for goods going into the city?—Exactly. Your suggestion is to put the goods sheds down back in the swamp—that is half-a-mile—would a cartier, if hired by the day or by the job, cart as cheaply half-a-mile further from the city as he would now?—I think 2s. is the cartage in town, and, I think, they cart to Sandridge for 2s. 6d., and that is four times the distance. As I say, it is the handling, the putting on and off, that makes the expense.

2295. You do not think carting half-a-mile more would cost any more?—No.

2296. Would a man go as many trips a day with that additional half-mile as he would the shorter distance?—That is very well, it put that way; if a cartier could get continually kept going, certainly not, but they are not kept continually going. A man has to wait half-a-day to get a load on the wharf. It is the trouble of getting the goods, and putting them on board your dray.

2297. In any alteration to be made the country has to be considered as well as the city, and I want to know whether the country producer would be put to any additional cost in getting his produce sent from the new goods sheds half-a-mile away—would it cost him any more?—It would not be a perfect scheme unless the wheat from the country could go down to the dock, and be swung straight into the ship.

2298. But you must feed your own population?—Then the cost of carting that would be merely nominal.

2299. As to the room for the passenger station and for all the increasing traffic, you saw Mr. Speight's evidence?—Yes.

2300. I think he stated that they required all the room, and more if they could get it?—Yes.

2301. Do you disagree with that?—I should not put my opinion as against Mr. Speight's, for accommodation, but I say a softeren to him would be to put a million of money to the credit of the Commissioners, and then his objections would fly.

2302. If it were 10 millions, and you had not room to do your work, it could not be done, and they say they require more room?—Well, they have now got 200 to 300 acres down in West Melbourne; if they were crowded up I could see the force of the question, but there is any amount of room.

2303. I believe that, for many years, you were a merchant in West Melbourne?—Yes.

2304. You moved to Flinders-lane, did you not?—Yes.

2305. What advantage did you get by getting down to Flinders-street from West Melbourne?—Perhaps a mistake.

2306. Where it was a matter of personal advantage, you took care to get into the middle of the traffic?—The reply to that is, I was near to the railway when I was in West Melbourne, and I found it did not answer my purpose, and I had to move further away. Those are the facts.

2307. We have spoken of country produce—can you tell us what are the bulkiest articles that come from the country?—Cabbages, I should think.

2308. May I suggest, is not hay the bulkiest?—That is bulky.

2309. And potatoes?—Yes.
2310. I understood you to say that there is a very large proportion of the Melbourne and suburban population to the north?—Yes.

2311. Would it be as convenient, if the station was north of Bourke-street, to the largest consuming portion of the population to have the goods landed there as it is here?—It would be more convenient, decidedly.

2312. Are you aware of any mills grinding grain received from the country supplying a very large proportion of the city and suburbs, whose position is greatly north of Bourke-street?—Yes, there are several greatly north—there is one in Brunswick-street.

2313. Have you seen the Carlton mills?—Yes, in Carlton.

2314. It does not follow in every case that, because goods are landed here, they are at a spot more convenient to where they are wanted than they would be a little further north?—No doubt they would be more convenient as a rule further north, because the great bulk of the consumers are there; and as regards hay, I will guarantee there is five times as much received north of Lonsdale-street than there is south.

2315. Are you aware that nearly all the key stores are up Elizabeth-street north?—Yes.

2316. Would firewood be as conveniently dealt with?—A great deal more so, for the bulk of the population; and as I said about the cartage of other merchandize, it would be more convenient; it would not make an essential difference in the price of carting, but it would be a decided advantage—it is the taking on and off.

2317. There is a very large suburb up Richmond way, and there are South Yarra, St. Kilda, and Emerald Hill on the south?—Yes.

2318. Are those places not to be taken into consideration in the railway goods sheds?—Yes, as I have said in my replies throughout, they should be considered; but, compared with the putting on and the taking off of that bulky stuff the distance would not make sixpence a ton difference—not fact it would not make anything at all.

2319. Then, according to that, North Melbourne would not be much benefited by taking it north?—No, there would not be much saving, but it would be only a little less convenient to the south.

2320. Then it does not make much difference to any one where the station is!—No, not as regards the cartage.

2321. As to cabbages coming down the country, the whole of the produce—wheat, hay, chaff, potatoes—coming into Melbourne—firewood, sawn timber—do not the whole of those come from the country?—Yes; and wool is brought to Bourke-street stores—that would be very handy.

2322. And in Collins-street there are wool and grain stores?—Yes, the biggest of all, Goldstroll's, is in Bourke-street.

2323. Are there many flour mills on the south side of the Yarra?—No, I do not know of any.

2324. If there are no mills on the south of the Yarra, that population must be supplied as to its bread stuffs from the mills on the north?—No doubt. They are a very enterprising people on the north.

2325. Ever since you have been connected with this question of extending the city westward it has always been a leading point that Collins-street should go westward—I understand you were all agreed on that in the original report?—Most decidedly; but Bourke-street did not come into the field; it was Collins-street, with a level road right through, and the gradients easy; Latrobe-street over the railway, and Dudley-street under the railway, raised 3 or 4 feet.

2326. All were agreed that Collins-street should go through?—They were unanimous on that point.

2327. Was there any proposed connection between the system then?—I think not; the outer circle was to connect them.

2328. At that time, was it thought that the docks would be in their present position?—No; I think the docks were thought of further to the north.

2329. Where that yellow is on the map!—They certainly were more north-west at that time—[looking at the map]—but the dock sites have been changed very many times; at one time they proposed to have them between Flinders-street and the Yarra—that ran into the basin or docks.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow, at Two o'clock.

FRIDAY, 13TH MAY, 1887.
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The Hon. J. A. Wallace, M.L.C, W. Cain, Esq.,

N. Thorley, P. Wright, Esq., M.L.A.,

W. Madden, W. Anderson, Esq., M.L.A.,


Thomas Walker, Esq., examined.

2329A. By the Commission.—What are you?—A carrier and wharf agent.

2330. How long have you been engaged in that business?—Since November, 1854.

2331. Do you cart goods to and from the various vessels at the wharf and from the goods sheds on the railway?—Yes.

2332. Have you heard of the proposal to extend Collins-street to the new docks?—Yes.

2333. Are you aware of the difference in level between the junction of Collins and Spencer-streets and the wharf level of the new docks?—Only what I have read in the papers; I am 45 and I believe the gradient will be.

2334. It is 1 in 20 with a viaduct?—Yes, that is with a viaduct.
From your experience as a carrier, do you think that any considerable quantity of goods would be brought from the docks by that route if it was opened, as against Flinders-street route?—Of course as to the question of the viaduct, I could scarcely say what effect that would have upon it; but I would say, taking the road now as it stands, without any obstruction between this and the hill, that the whole of the goods, except those going the other side, would come up those streets; but if you had to make an embankment to cross over a viaduct or a bridge, that would very much militate against the traffic going in that direction.

If the viaduct necessitated a grade of 1 in 30 in every portion of the extension, would that drive the traffic out of the streets altogether?—No, the whole of the traffic up here to this brick shed is less, I think, than from Spencer-street; I think the gradient would be steeper than even over the viaduct, but notwithstanding the steepness of the gradient if Collins-street and Bourke-street were the nearest thoroughfare to and from the docks and warehouses of the city, I think goods would be carried that way.

Does any considerable quantity of goods pass from these sheds over Spencer-street?—They pass from these sheds in enormous quantity.

Not along the portion of Spencer-street lying between Collins-street and the wharf?—They carry that hill by going in here—referring to the plan—but there from the wharf you must come up there; the great bulk comes from the wharf to the sheds. Vehicles going to any part of Collins-street, Bourke-street, or Lonsdale-street, west of Elizabeth-street, from Flinders-street, must take the hill in one place or another, and in some it is a pretty steep gradient. The hill near the Sir Charles Hotham hotel is very steep, and I do not think you would have any steeper than that in any portion of the proposed new extension. I have brought goods here thirty years ago; and we came up with a large quantity of lime, up the hill here behind the old powder magazine; but when proper and wide roads are made there will be no difficulty in coming up there I think.

Which would you prefer, the extension of Collins-street on the grade I have mentioned, or the wider grade Flinders-street twice or three times its present width?—I would like both as far as I am concerned, and I think from my experience of the way the traffic is increasing it will have to come, because the traffic on those side roads is positively dangerous, especially this road at the foot of the hill, where the tramway goes along; that is a most disgraceful road, and accidents happen on it every day. Within the last ten days I saw four accidents on it myself.

That road is now 33 feet wide?—Yes.

If that were widened to say 200 feet, do you think there would be any liability to accident through block?—I do not think there would be nearly so much danger with the traffic if these streets were opened here. The traffic going to Fitzroy where there is an enormous population and large shops, and into Collingwood where large quantities of goods are stored, would make for these other streets, instead of Flinders-street. People think all the traffic must go to Flinders-street; that is a great mistake; there is a large portion that goes to warehouses outside Melbourne. In Flannem, in East Collingwood, and in different parts there are manufactories, and large quantities of heavy goods would go street up those streets, and, as a carrier, I would say they would all make for the direction of Latrobe-street, because you have not much pulling up that street.

At the present time, any one can see that the great bulk of the goods is carried along Flinders-street, as against the other streets?—There is a great deal, but goods going to the northern part of the district nearly always come up Spencer-street, and then they take Latrobe-street or Lonsdale-street; they take the easier streets when they get further up, to avoid the hills.

We will take the part of the dock near the Gasworks and imagine a carrier with a lorry and two or three tons of goods on it, and wishing to deliver those goods at the Collingwood Gasworks—would you sketch out the route he would be likely to take—imagine Collins-street open through, and Latrobe-street open through to the dock?—He would go by Latrobe-street, most likely, if it was a good road, but if it was a road such as we have down here at the foot of the hill, at the back of the coal yards, any one would go a long way to avoid that.

You think Latrobe-street would be preferable to Collins-street?—For that part of the district, of course it would, that is for the northern part; but for all the large warehouses here in Collins and Bourke-street, such as Goldsborough's, all the great wool and grain stores, they would go up Collins-street.

That is because if they went along Flinders-street line, they would sail all the hill between the junction of Flinders-street and Collins-street to mount, which hill would be equivalent to the level between the junction of Spencer-street and Collins-street and the docks?—Yes. There is another advantage to my mind in having these streets open; all the empty vehicles would go down those near streets, they would not care how steep the hill; the steeper the better in going down, and that would relieve the traffic in the stream where the laden waggons were coming from the docks, and the waggons coming with the passengers.

Suppose the question was to be decided of the extension of either Collins-street or Latrobe-street to the docks, which would you prefer?—I should think Latrobe-street, taking the city as a whole, the great northern portion. I would say Latrobe-street.

Of course you have seen the expansion of the Melbourne station, having been so long in the business?—Yes.

Have you any recollections of the date when this Batman's Hill was first proposed to be cut down?—I remember the day they commenced to cut it down, but I do not remember the date; I remember the circumstance.

Do you know the object of cutting it down?—I think it was to make filling up to the lands level.

Was it not to increase the railway accommodation?—I dare say that was one of the objects, by the building of the large sheds.

Would it be wise to part with that land after having reclaimed and considered it available for railway purposes, and turn it into streets and sites for buildings?—I certainly should—that is in my own private opinion, supposing the land belonged to me, and I had a substantial station to build some day. I would say build it in a place where it would accommodate all the alluvion at that time, and consider it in the various streets, so that the streets could be opened to it; that is, I would shift the streets back to the docks, let the whole of the streets go there and build the station at the end of the docks, so that passengers...
could come down, and you would be near your vessels, and that would be a great saving in many respects; people could go right to the ships from the station, or come from the ships to the station.

2353. But with the extension and the proposed new sheds, if you had to go half-a-mile further, would it materially increase the cost?—Not materially; it might a small trifle, but we can far beyond that now—some sheds are a quarter of a mile beyond the Gasworks.

2354. Take the yield of the produce of the country, and lift it half-a-mile further away from the present sheds, what per ton, difference on what that would make?—Not say I think; for the present warehouses it might make a small difference, it would take more time, but if the sheds were made convenient for the receiving and delivery of goods, it would far more than compensate for the extra distance.

2355. Taking the warehouses to the goods, and not bringing the goods to the warehouses?—Of course round the docks would be all filled with warehouses; but I might mention this in that that struck me that would facilitate the traffic of goods in Melbourne, which is becoming simply enormous—there should be another steam ferry across the Yarra near the Gasworks. I think that was one of the best things ever done in the colony, placing a steam ferry at the bottom of Spencer-street. I think there should be another, so that all the great southern districts could be supplied in that way, timber, coal, and other goods coming from Sandridge could go to the station over the ferry without going through the streets, and rice, etc. We have now to take cargoes right away to the ferry at the foot of Spencer-street, or cross over the Falls-bridge, to reach a vessel or factory perhaps, just across the river, from the ship we are taking the goods from. I am now taking a shipment of coke at No. 10 shelf, earning it right up my hill, all through the streets, and then crossing over and taking it directly up on the other side. If you had another steam ferry you could make it a light half a heavy traffic and passengers, and you would have easy access to all the southern districts, South Melbourne, Prahran, St. Kilda, and North, and you could bring all your heavy traffic, timber, &c., from Sandridge across there, without coming through the city at all, or go to ships where it was to be delivered without going through the streets.

2356. That would relieve Flinders-street very considerably?—Yes; the steam ferry there now does it a great deal, and that would do it more.

2357. You said your scheme would be the greatest facility for distributing the goods at that point, where they are put is the dry?—Yes; at present everything has to make for Flinders-street. You are compelled to get into it; but then you might work for days and weeks without having to come into Flinders-street at all. All the coals for those districts for instance would go over that way, and timber from all the ships would go at that way. A great many mistakenly imagine that the trade of the port is confined to what is required to supply Victoria. As a matter of fact we supply the Southern Hemisphere; a large proportion of the goods are taken out of the ocean steamers and shipped again in sailing vessels and mercantile steamers, and ships are constantly taking goods to India, China, Japan, and other ports, and bringing goods back, and those goods have to be brought from other ships to those vessels, or from the warehouses, and if you had another access when so many of the goods are landed at Sandridge, then you would avoid a great deal of the rush of traffic that we have now in Flinders-street.

2358. Then it would be advisable to have the goods sheds as near the water way as possible?—Yes.

2359. That would not be achieved by putting the station back as you suggest, half-a-mile further away than now?—That would be for the river frontage, out for the docks I understand you would have the station just across the end of the docks. I think that is the proposal.

2360. Then do you think that this land, having been reclaimed for railway purposes, might be taken from the railway department, and handed over for ordinary building allotments?—No, I say let the railway have the benefit of this land; I would not sell it at all. I would keep it and lease it, and let the railway take it as money to improve their premises.

2361. If the Railway department say they would rather have the land for the more convenient working of the system, would you still persist in your view?—I dare say they do. I have always had the impression that the railway people must make their own local public, and that they do not care as long as they get the goods into their sheds how they get them out, or in what sort of loads.

2362. You would not suggest that the Railway department as a body is antagonistic to the public?—They are to a certain extent. Their own claims and desires would be carried out without any regard to the public convenience. For instance, they will bring goods from Williamstown and put them down in perfect pews of wood, and you may go in and get them out the best way you can; they do not seem to care at all where goods are deposited on being unloaded from the trucks. I do not think they give the public that consideration they ought to do; at least they do not give it to carriers.

2363. That would point out that the present arrangement is not satisfactory?—Very unsatisfactory. If you want to get from (see lower levels below Lansdale-street you have to go round by Flinders-street to get round on Lansdale-street, full of goods.

2364. It is proposed to alter all that, and put goods sheds on this very land you say might be alienated by leasing?—No doubt if the sheds were erected down near the docks, as I suggest, that would very materially improve it.

2365. I want you for a moment just to imagine this reserved piece of railway land denuded of buildings and everything, and that you are brought in as an expert, and asked with your knowledge of the trade of Melbourne to show us the proper place, and the best place, the most convenient and cheapest place for handling goods and building a new goods station—where would you put it?—I would put it right across the end of the docks, because you see when you get those docks completed and ships in, you will have all those good in to leave higher up. If you have your station here—[pointing to the plan]—those goods will all have to be loaded there; they can either go into the trucks and go into the station, or you can take the street right to the sheds the sheds being quite close to the docks, the trucks can go down from the sheds, and they are at the right place.
suffer. People may say, "Oh it is just as well to continue getting our goods from Sandridge by rail." I say no; I say unhesitatingly that the colony has lost as much in breakage and damage from bringing goods from Williamsburg as the cost of bringing those very goods all the way from England. For instance, I had to cart a large amount of goods that came out for Mr. Joseph Clarke; the contents of the cases were literally smashed to pieces. I cannot say, but it was stated the cases were in perfect order on board ship; when landed in the Railway department here the contents were smashed to pieces, and that is an instance of what is happening every day. Wine, beer, and spirits are goods liable to break, and should be handled as little as possible. I would take them to the point you have to take them with but not having to cart them if you can help it. It has become so customary now that they always look upon it as a certain percentage of breakage. I do not see why it should be; I do not see why a hundred cases of beer should not come out without breakage, but it is the tumbling about and stacking, and it is the same with bags of wheat: a bag bursts and lets out some four or five pounds of wheat, and that being repeated hundreds of times a day a lot of grain is lost.

2367. You think some land might be taken from the department and leased—why should it be leased?—All those blocks between the streets, say between Flanders-street and Collins-street, and Collins-street and Bourke-street, I suppose the department would take up all they could for their own use.

2368. For their own use the department say they require it and more?—I say then by all means keep it, but my idea was they would never require such a huge block as that. It is an enormous block of land down to the proposed docks, and my idea was they might lease this land and have the revenue come in to assist them in keeping their ships and stations in repair.

2369. What would be your object in leasing the land instead of selling it altogether?—I do not believe in selling at all myself.

2370. Is it a mere matter of opinion?—Yes.

2371. You do not mean that the department might want to take possession of it by-and-by?—No, but I do not know how the city may grow, and the time might come when they might require some of it; but it seems to me an enormous tract of land for a station.

2372. The station even now is merely in its infancy?—Yes, I believe that.

2373. If the Railway Department, the Commissioners, and the officers of the department, say that the land is absolutely necessary, I suppose you would not go against their opinion?—I would not like to put my opinion against theirs, but at the same time I think for many years to come the proposed site will be quite sufficient for them; but I would like to keep the land in the hands of the Government, so that it could be taken over in time to come, the same as the corporation has done with the Western and Eastern Markets; it would be a great source of revenue.

2374. You think the land might be required for railway purposes?—Yes, it might be in fifteen years.

2375. Would it not then be advisable to keep the land without any outside interests on it?—No, I think not—there are now five or six acres of land between Flanders-street and the station with no use being made of it.

2376. It is proposed to utilise that—have you seen the plan of the proposed alterations?—No.

2377. If the railway authorities say, "We want this land that you allude to for offices, and this Commission were to recommend that they could erect their offices over the station now in Collins-street, and sell this land that we speak of, and devote the money to building a large station, which would you approve of—the recommendation of the Commission or of the railway authorities?—I would certainly recommend the erection of the offices over the station further north.

2378. And utilise the land here?—Yes, lease it; I would not sell it.

2379. Suppose goods landed at the dock—the incline of Bourke-street and Collins-street would be less, and Flanders-street would be on a level?—Yes.

2380. Would you consider the difference in incline is Bourke-street, or Collins-street, or Flanders-street, under these circumstances?—It would depend entirely on what part I was taking the goods to; for instance to the great bonded warehouses in Lonsdale-street. I would go up those streets rather than Flanders-street, even if it was steeper, because when I get along Lonsdale-street in any case I shall have a hill.

2381. Suppose you had a way of taking those goods over at Latrobe-street, with an incline of 1 in 30, would you go by that means?—I would go by Latrobe-street then, because I think that is one of the best streets that heavy traffic could go on; there is not much hill either way, and if you go to the great northern suburbs, Hotham, Carlton, Fitzroy, and Collingwood, with goods you would have scarcely any heavy pulling there.

2382. So, assuming we have a viaduct at Latrobe-street, and Flanders-street is widened and improved, and Collins-street and Bourke-street opened, you would either take Latrobe-street or Flanders-street rather than Collins or Bourke-street?—Yes, if I was going in that direction, I would; but if I was going to Goldsbrough's stores with wheat or flour, I would go up Bourke or Collins street, and if you build the station across the end of the docks, all the goods you send to the station would go down these streets; there would be as big a traffic down to the ships, and those ships have to be loaded again.

2383. Where does the great bulk of the goods go to—tces it go as far up as Goldsbrough's?—It goes over the whole district—to Collingwood, Fitzroy, Jolimont. I take thousands of tons of goods to Collingwood, to a warehouse I have there.

2384. Those goods would go by Latrobe-street?—Certainly every load, because I would strike into Victoria Parade; there at once you have a road clean, wide, and well made, and not very much hill.

2385. Do you think that with Latrobe-street made and Flanders-street widened as proposed, the accommodation thus given would be sufficient?—It might for a while, but I think the time would come when it would not be sufficient; you have done the last thing for those very goods we have on the line, and you might not.

2386. You have seen the growth of the railway station in the last fifteen years?—Yes.

2387. If that should go on increasing during the next fifteen years at the same rate, will not a very large area be required for their purposes?—I think so, but there is a lot of land occupied here uselessly. Large quantities of timber from Gippsland are brought here through the city, and then carted back the next day to the districts they come through. They are dragged from Gippsland, hauled through Flanders-street and deposited on the levels here, and then we go and cart timber back to Hawthorn, South Yarra, Prahran, and other places.
2387. Where should that timber from Gippsland be unloaded?—I think in one of the outskirts of the city, beyond South Yarra, some depot; and then in the northern suburbs there should be another great depot.

2388. You know the outer circle line?—Yes; that will relieve the city streets wonderfully.

2389. I suppose the arrangement will be to deliver the timber in the northern suburbs?—I suppose so. It should be borne in mind that very few people live about this district; you have to take goods and timber to the district where the people live, and the idea of bringing it past people’s doors and taking it back, it is an enormous expense to some one. It does not go by magic, it has to be paid for by some one.

2390. That would show that station yards would be judiciously established in the suburbs of the city—large station yards?—Yes, for such things as lime and timber and so on.

2391. Also other kinds of goods!—All other kinds.

2392. If you do that for yourselves in Collingwood and Brunswick it would not require such a large station yard in Spencer-street?—Oh no; I suppose when the railway is open to Brunswick they would get the firewood there, and it is being done with all the districts that have not this convenience. There are 80,000 people in Collingwood and Fitzroy, and every ton has to be taken from those yards, whereas they might have it convenient to them.

2393. Instead of 160 acres with a large station here, you think four or five stations in those places would be more serviceable to the city?—I do indeed.

2394. When you were asked about the gradient of 1 in 20 in Collins-street did you understand that Collins-street would be carried over the railway; I understand that your view is that Collins-street and Bourke-street should be carried through just on the present level?—Yes, sloping gradually down to the station.

2395. In that case there would be no such gradient as 1 in 20?—No.

2396. Assuming that there was no particular viaduct fixed upon, would it then be your opinion that Collins-street and Bourke-street should be carried through further west, in the best manner possible, consistent with railway arrangements?—Certainly.

2397. And is it your view, as a gentleman of large experience, that the intervening blocks of land should be either sold or leased?—I understand you to recommend leasing?—Yes.

2398. For the benefit of the State, generally, or the Railway Department?—Yes.

2399. Now you speak of accidents having occurred, three or four within the last week in Flinders-street?—Yes.

2400. What part of Flinders-street was it?—This portion here at the foot of Spencer-street, running from there into the railway yard, here at the back; I do not know what they call the street.

2401. You connected your statement with some reference to the trams?—Yes.

2402. I was led to believe that it had something to do with it, it had something to do with tram traffic?—I meant by tram the railway over which the locomotive engines bring the traffic in Flinders-street; it is called the tram.

2403. As a gentleman of large experience, would you inform the Commission on which side of the Yarra is the bulk of the country produce carried for the purpose of dealing and consumption?—On the north side, most decidedly.

2404. Then as to all the land which is now the railway ground on this side, the northern line of Bourke-street, assuming that the railway is pushed back much further north, would you believe that any sectional part of the metropolitan population or trading people would suffer in any way, or would the cost of transit to those places of business or to the consumer in any portion, including the south and north be enhanced?—I scarcely understand the question.

2405. Would it increase the cost of carrying the goods to any portion of Melbourne or its suburbs as they are now, if the station were removed on the north side of that side of Bourke-street?—Not materially, scarcely at all. Supposing the station was made in Bourke-street, facing Bourke-street, and Spencer-street, and you had the goods shunt there, the cost would be very little more. You have to take this into consideration, that while it might increase it in the districts to the south it would lessen the cost in the districts to the north—that must benefit some districts.

2406. That would be a very poor consolation to the district where it would be increased?—That we cannot help.

2407. It is your opinion, as now expressed, that the largest bulk of the country produce goes to the north?—I think so.

2408. That being so actually at present, and as you put it, all having to come through Melbourne streets, does not it now increase the cost to the consumer to the north having to carry the goods by Flinders-street?—I do not think the difference would be much.

2409. I speak of at present?—No, I do not think there is any great difference; it is not the distance so much if you get facility for loading and unloading your goods—it is the handling and the expense of labor.

2410. Then, if you believe that now, having to bring goods through Flinders-street for the purpose of being consumed or dealt with as far north as North Carlton, and North Fitzroy, and Collingwood, it must be very clear that the removing of the station a few chains beyond there could not enhance the cost to the people on the south side of the Yarra?—I do not think so—I think you are arguing to show that it is an absolute necessity that the goods should come by Flinders-street, but if this new proposal is carried out you would have the station back a great deal and the goods would not go that way.

2411. No, I am dealing with the fact that it goes there now, and I understand you to say that there is no other outlet but that very roundabout one. The cost to the consumers in the north is scarcely increased thereby, if that is so. I reason that it would not be very materially or at all increased to the southern consumers if the station was removed a few chains further north?—I do not think it would materially; it might make a small difference. Of course, the goods shunt are to the north of Bourke-street as at present. I think you are speaking as regards the timber from the lower level by the Gasworks.

2412. Is not the outlet there by Flinders-street?—It all has to come that way at present.

2413. Have you ever thought of a possible route coming through Dudley-street?—Yes; Dudley-street, as I look at the plan, would be one of the outlets, but one that carriers would not take if they could get up Lutrostree—thet is the street they would make for.
2414. You think, in point of fact, that Latrobe-street for ever hereafter will be the main ingress and egress to the railway station and the docks?—I think so. I do not know the gradient of Dudley-street, but I am told it is very steep.

2415. It is 1 in 277?—With a good road that would be very easily got up. The pulling up those hills is nothing to what we have in Sydney; and in England, in such places as Shields and Newcastle, where they have enormous hills to go up—the hills we have here are not to be spoken of in the same day. You can make roads to North Melbourne that any horse can go up when the streets are wide, so that a horse can have room to work.

2416. You spoke of Bannow's Hill in 1847?—Yes; I took line up from the banks of the river then.

2417. I believe there was a large amount of traffic all the way to North Melbourne, over the swamp then?—Yes.

2418. I think you will say it was the driest summer we have seen in Victoria in 1863?—Yes.

2419. Even in its state of nature, and rapid as the incline was then, you curried on a large amount of traffic?—Yes.

2420. You spoke of accidents in Flinders-street; that is the portion of the street west of Spencer-street?—Yes.

2421. What is the present width of that street?—Thirty odd feet.

2422. Do you know that it is proposed to make that nearly three chains wide?—I saw from the papers that it was proposed to widen that street.

2423. If the street had been that width now those accidents have been likely to occur?—I do not think they would. The accidents are caused by the skidding of the wheels of the cars on the railway; they catch the rails and skid along and the axle breaks, something must give. It has been pointed out over and over again that that could be remedied by planking with red gum but it has never been done.

2424. Your evidence on that point was to show that the present width of that street is much too small?—Quite so, and I am certain as long as that is the case all the traffic comes mingling there because the coal ships are discharging on the wharf road. You now have a large collier discharging perhaps 3,000 tons of coal, and wagons and carts going down in such numbers that they block the way.

2425. In your opinion the widening of Flinders-street the whole way along is a very important work?—Very important indeed. That railway should never have been allowed to come along there; it is only a single line and could have been taken out with little expense with a retaining wall. It has been a serious matter to many a poor man through breaking his cart or injuring his horse.

2426. Is it imperative, do you think, that the two stations should be connected by rail?—I think it is very desirable indeed.

2427. That being so, do you think that the proposed viaduct would meet all the requirements in connecting the two, carrying it above the traffic?—I do. It must be carried on piers.

2428. And, given a wide street, do you believe that the viaduct would interfere very materially with the traffic?—No. Of course it would go up a portion of the land between Flinders-street and the station; but that would not interfere with the roadway. In many parts of England the trains go over the cities. Thirty or forty years ago, in my native town of Newcastle, they went over the top of the city. We rode over houses and churches and everything.

2429. You spoke of shifting the railway station back to the end of the docks; in that case, now would you propose for vehicular traffic to get to the docks?—That is just one of the things that has puzzled me. Of course, that has to be provided for, and arranged, but there are competent gentlemen in Melbourne who have said it can be done. If, for instance, you raise your station up it would take away the steepness of the roads here, and you could make archways underneath the railway line through which the traffic could pass.

2430. Raising the station—would not that involve raising the goods from the ships' holds a good deal higher?—There is that difficulty, of course; I cannot speak on that point. I am not an engineer, but I have heard that that difficulty could be got over, in what way I cannot say myself.

2431. I understand that in addition to cutting the station off at Bourke-street you would shift the whole thing closer to the docks, away from Spencer-street altogether?—Yes, and carry the streets right on. I may mention that an enormous deal of traffic from the wharves comes up Spencer-street, and in busy time, such as race time or holiday time, it is positively dangerous to people alighting from cars and carriages—the heavy waggons with timber, and long iron rails and girder-plates going to foundries and factories to the north; and the tramways are there now at the same time, and the unfortunate thing is that the heavy-loaded traffic happens to have to go on the side of the road next the station, while the light vehicles are on the other, because, you must remember that carts are not always loaded; and all the other streets, whether steep or not, will be available for going down with empty vehicles, which would relieve the thoroughfare where the traffic now mostly converges.

2432. You spoke of the population to the north and the population to the south—in there not as much room for growth of population to the south of the Yarra as there is to the north?—I think so, but I do not think the working classes incline that way; they seem to incline the other way.

2433. When you spoke of heavy traffic in holiday time, what did you refer to?—I say that in holiday times and racing times Spencer-street is so much taken up with passenger traffic that it is a most difficult thing for a man to plot his way through; and there are places where the men have to take the goods north, to which they must go up those streets.

2434. Inasmuch as it has been put before us in evidence by the Commissioners that they cannot afford to have this portion taken away from them without having something of the same size from another quarter, where would you recommend that an equal amount of area should be given for the purposes of railway traffic if this was taken away from them?—I think I stated before that my plan would be to remove the station back—go further west.

2435. That is where you recommend to take an equal amount of land?—Yes; I think there would be nothing in the way except, possibly, Mr. William's coach factory.

2436. Assuming Flinders-street to be made two or three chains wide all through, which would you prefer to have in addition—Bourke-street, Collins-street, or Latrobe-street?—I would say Latrobe-street of those three.
2437. It divides up the country better?—Yes, it would be best for the general population.

2438. If the railway station were removed north of Bourke-street I suppose you know it would then be impossible to make a viaduct over Latrobe-street?—I did not know that.

2439. You must see that the distance would be too short from the station to Latrobe-street—that any obstruction would be a very serious matter for the improvement of the railways?—Yes, I dare say it would; but I speak from my own point of view as a carrier. I do not speak about railways as an engineer.

2440. Of the streets mentioned, you think Latrobe would be the best one to put through from a carrying point of view?—Certainly.

2441. The effect of your evidence is, then, that the city would be divided into two northern, central, and southern systems, and the traffic of the first would be best met by the extension of Latrobe-street?—Yes.

2442. And the central system by the extension of Flinders-street?—Yes.

2443. And you particularly mention the establishment of steam ferries across the Yarra in order to relieve Flinders-street?—Yes.

2444. And the southern system would of course be fed by Flinders-street, and those steam ferries crossing the Yarra to it?—Yes; no doubt a second ferry further down would be a great advantage and would relieve Flinders-street very materially, but it would not avoid the getting up those hills by lorries and waggons; they would have to come to the great warehouses facing us here and in William-street and King-street. Those are the great centres of traffic and commerce, and if you continue the traffic to those two streets you would always still to get up to the warehouses and the main arteries of the city where the traffic is carried on.

2445. You think Collins-street ought to run through?—I certainly do.

2446. If it were produced in a straight line it would not touch the docks—(showing a plan)—I understand there would be a very wide street in front of the new proposed station to which all the traffic would make. Of course it would follow the same divergence as the Australian Wharf does in the course of the river. I may say that land is becoming so valuable in the narrow streets, such as Little Collins and Little Bourke streets, that warehouses are now being built there on account of getting the land so much cheaper.

2447. That has been going on for years?—Yes, you see in Little Collins-street they are putting up some magnificent places, and in Little Bourke-street, in the western end, and it will be continued in those narrow streets and in Flinders-lane; and if Collins and Bourke streets were carried through, all those smaller streets would still be available for traffic.

The witness withdrew.

Capt. R. Fullarton examined.

2448. By the Commissioner.—What are you?—Chief Harbour Master.

2449. How long have you held that office?—I have been Harbour Master in Melbourne for sixteen years.

2450. You know the site of the new docks?—I do, very well.

2451. Have you studied the best means of getting access to those docks?—I have.

2452. What would you propose?—I have thought the matter over carefully for many years, and I consider that if Flinders-street was extended as far down as the Gasworks and an extra road made round the northern corner of the Gasworks, so as to meet the Flinders-street road near the site of the docks—(explaining his meaning on the plan)—that is, it would be necessary to form a junction by widening Flinders-street to 200 feet and also widening the Australian Wharf road where it is bottle-necked at the Gasworks, and making a good viaduct over Latrobe-street, and another at Dudley-street; I should think it would meet all requirements as long as Melbourne is a city.

2453. What do you think of the proposal to dispose of the greater portion of the present railway yard?—I think that not any part could be disposed of. The south-western part of it will all be required for warehouses and other appliances in connexion with the docks; the part close to the river, as you may observe on the plan, is taken up entirely by water, being the dock area, and projected into it, and means for transit, but no provision for warehouses, so that naturally it follows you must bow towards the railway to get accommodation for warehouses.

2454. How would you get to the Crown Lands by the docks?—By Latrobe-street, and by widening the Dudley-street bridge.

2455. A continuation of the road along the river?—Yes, that is also my opinion. I would like further to add that, if you look at the area, I do not see much that is to be gained by extending two streets to the westward, there is such a small area. You have nothing of an area left to continue Melbourne beyond Spencer-street. Besides, if you did, it would be simply a continuation of roads; you would have very little land for building purposes of any value.

2456. Do you think that the traffic from the docks would pass the extension of Collins-street or Bourke-street instead of Flinders-street or Latrobe-street?—I partially went over the line to-day, to refresh my mind up to date upon the subject, and I am of opinion that, if Flinders-street was widened and extended, and a viaduct over Latrobe-street, that route would be taken in preference to the extension of Collins or Bourke streets.

2457. You think the present site of the station, and the access to the station, is one that should not be disturbed?—It should not be disturbed, and I think that the remaining part of that part of West Melbourne swamp should be reserved for over for dock purposes. In fifty years' time you will want a much larger dock area for the city of Melbourne. This is the only part in Victoria, and what is shown on that plan will not be half sufficient for the dock accommodation of the colony.

2458. Would it be possible to remove the site of the docks a little further west than what is now proposed?—I think most people would like to see them removed further east, if it were not for the railway.

2459. Is not the site governed by the month of the new cut?—It is by the month of the new cut, and if you remove the docks further west, you would have to make new entrances to them from the new cut.
2460. Then it would be scarcely possible to give to the Railway Commissioners control of land much further west than they have at present?—The Railway Commissioners I suppose have got all they require to the westward of Dudley-street canal. If they want any more, they must extend further west in the swamp, and get to the by the present extension of their lands.

2461. This plan shows the position?—I presume the piece coloured pink represents all they want at present for the railways. The remainder, coloured yellow, should be reserved for the extensions of the railway and for dock purposes. It will be all wanted in time to come.

2462. The extension of the railway system would include the erection of large goods stores and warehouses belonging to the Railway Department?—Yes. The Railway Department must of necessity do so, because the whole of the produce of the country will be landed in connexion with the main railway system of the country.

2463. Your view is distinctly that it would be a mistake for the colony, at the present time, to part with a single inch of the land of the West Melbourne swamp?—I would not part with an inch, and I have thought the thing out for many years, and have seen the progress of the city for the last thirty years.

2464. Have you seen the plan submitted to this Commission by Mr. Thwaites?—I have not.

2465. Showing the whole of the West Melbourne swamp cut up into docks and warehouses?—I have heard of the plan. But I think he makes places for people to live in, which I do not think is necessary; and I think there are better sites for residences away from West Melbourne swamp.

2466. You have just stated that it is desirable to bring the docks as near to the warehouses as possible. Would it not be better to have docks and warehouses together?—Part of my evidence was, that I expected that the Harbour Trust and the Railway Department would build warehouses and all other appliances as close as they can to the docks.

2467. It is not provided for at the present time, and if I understand Mr. Thwaites rightly, the docks should have warehouses built along the margin of them. You say you have not room here, but that might be altered if the works are not yet constructed—the proposed docks?—The plans of the proposed docks are accepted and a contract is to be taken for the first section in a few weeks.

2468. Could have docks running through the swamp, with warehouses on their margins, and here, into which you could take the goods from the ships?—I presume that will be done. It is no use making warehouses unless you have docks in close contiguity.

2469. Instead of building large docks and warehouses a quarter of a mile away, would it not be better to have stores built along each dock?—Yes, along each dock I think it will be necessary to make reservations for storage and warehouse purposes in the locality of the dock.

2470. I was thinking of actual storage?—Yes.

2471. So that the goods might be brought into the warehouse without handling?—Yes.

2472. Thero practically is room for that?—Plenty of room now, in that plan.

2473. Around the docks as proposed by Sir John Coode?—Yes, I take it for granted that, if this is ever to be a wheat producing country, there will be large stores in the railway yards for wheat, so that trains may run in to them, and the same with regard to wool. A firm waited upon me to-day asking if they could get accommodation for wool stores, to dump the wool and press it and put it in the ships, in contiguity to the proposed dock.

2474. I understand that the wool stores are to be erected here, at North Melbourne?—I want to know whether they could not come in here—pointing to the plan—between the Gasworks and the docks. There are lots of people who have an eye on all the sites there, and there will be plenty of applications for them.

2475. If you were to construct warehouses there now, you would find a ready customer for the accommodation?—Yes, immediately.

2476. Would it not be better to have wool-preserving stores, or grain elevators, all along the edge of the docks themselves, and the railway coming along?—I say so—that is just what I say.

2477. The plans referred to show them a considerable distance away from there, and even the other that you alluded to just now, between the proposed dock and the Gasworks, would still require that there should be carriage in some way?—There would be a tramway laid right alongside to the wharf. That is a matter that has been proposed by the Railway Department to the Harbour Trust, to have power to run the railway right alongside the ships. I should like to say that a great deal of talk has been made about the Flinders-street road. That back road is 93 feet wide only; and 16 or 18 feet it has been taken up with a line of rails from the railway yard, which breaks up the whole of the continuity of the back road; and I would also point out that something must be done with the two railways in the way of a connexion by a viaduct. You can never carry on with the ordinary trains across Flinders-street; the whole of the place is blocked by long trains passing at a snail's pace, blocking the whole traffic. I should like to impress on you that, without any delay, the viaduct to join the two railways should be carried out.

The witness withdrew.
2496. I did not mention Dudley-street, never mind that, but you entirely ignore Bourke-street and Collins-street?—I think the gradient would be too steep in either of those.

2497. You heard Mr. Walker's evidence as to that matter—he said that carriers would not mind the incline if they had to deliver goods at a certain portion of the city—is that your experience?—It would do for going down, but I do not like going up steep hills.

2498. Do you think the widening of Flinders-street at that narrow portion where it is 33 feet wide to something like three chains and continuing that width all along the bank of the river, with a junction road to the east of the Gasworks leading to the face of the docks, would be the principal means used to get to those docks?—I think so.

2499. You do not think it would be necessary to extend Collins-street or Bourke-street?—I do not think it would.

2500. Would you think it advisable to dispose of any of the present station grounds?—A portion would have to be taken from the railway to widen Flinders-street.

2501. Leaving that out?—I would be in favour of having it widened 300 feet there.

2502. Would you favour the disposal to private individuals of any portion of the station ground for building purposes altogether foreign to the railway system after that has been taken away?—I would not part with any ground there.

2503. You think the railway system will require all that?—I think so.

2504. Do you think the Department could recoup itself by the extension of land further back if it parted with 30 or 40 acres in the position I name?—Not at present.

2505. You are decidedly against any alteration?—Except the widening of Flinders-street.

2506. And the extension of Latrobe-street and Dudley-street?—Yes.

2507. You think that would be sufficient?—Yes.

2508. What do you think about the proposal for a steam ferry across the Yarra?—I think that is wanted more than anything. That would take the whole of the traffic from that point to the South Melbourne side and back again; you have to go two miles round to get to the sheds now. I am carting now from No. 3 shed south.

2509. Where would you put the steam ferry?—Opposite the Gasworks.

2510. That would take a very large amount of traffic?—That would go a direct road to Sandridge or South Melbourne.

2511. And very largely save the Sandridge road?—Yes.

2512. What would be the difference in the cost per ton for carriage in that case taken in the way you speak of?—Perhaps 6d. a ton from Sandridge.

2513. You mean that to not to take the road from the Gasworks round by the Falls Bridge and back would save 6d.; you would have to pay for the ferry, but you would save time, which would be worth more than 6d. a ton. I am sure it would be 6d. a ton more going round than it would be by crossing. I think it would be even more.

2514. Besides the loss of time?—Yes.

2515. What would the loss of time be equivalent to on a ton of goods?—If you had to take the road round from the Gasworks it would take an hour, that would be 4s. an hour, and less 6d. for the ferry.

2516. That would be saved on every load of goods taken from there?—Yes, and they would take a heavier load.

2517. And it would relieve the streets of the traffic?—Yes, quite a third of the traffic. The whole of the coal trade is supposed to go over there, and if there is not a steam ferry you cannot get over the north bank of the Yarra. It is worse getting over the Falls than it is in Flinders-street.

The witness withdrawn.

Adjourned to Thursday fortnight, at Two o'clock.

THURSDAY, 26TH MAY, 1887.

Present:

The Hon. A. L. Tucker, M.P., in the Chair;

W. Williams, Esq., contractor.

W. Williams, Esq., 26th May 1887.

The Hon. Col. F. T. Sargood, C.M.G., M.C., | John Laurens, Esq., M.P.,
J. A. Wallace, M.L.C.,  | J. H. Wheeler, Esq., M.P.,
N. Thorley, M.L.C., | W. Cain, Esq.,
Robert Burrowes, M.P., | J. C. Stewart, Esq.,
W. Anderson, Esq., M.P., | Clement Hodgkinson, Esq.,

William Williams, Esq., examined.

2508. By the Commission.—What are you?—Railway carriage and waggon builder and general

2509. You are in occupation of a piece of land not far from here?—I am.

2510. How long have you been in occupation of that land?—Twenty-six years.

2511. Is it a freehold?—Yes.

2512. Have you observed the evidence that has been given before the Commission as to the advisability of extending streets up to near the vicinity of your ground?—Yes, I have, some of it.

2513. What is your opinion as to that question of extending Collins-street through the railway yard?—The encroachment as to which is of paramount importance—the extension of the city westward or the needs of the Railway Department?

2514. Which do you think of paramount importance?—To some extent I suppose it is a matter of speculation; but I think there can be little doubt but that the extension of the city westward may be taken as a very probable event, and therefore of great importance.

2515. Would you prefer to see the land occupied by city buildings, and the station curtailed to that extent?—I think that whichever was considered the paramount matter the other side, of course, would
have to give way. If it becomes necessary that a large area be occupied by the extension of the city westward then adequate approaches would have to be provided, I apprehend.

2516. How would you arrive at a solution of that question which of the two is of the greater importance?—That is connected, of course, with what would be possible as to the Railway Department accommodating itself to what was required in the way of approaches for the extension of the city. I am very much opposed to Flinders-street, narrowed down to its minimum width, would be altogether inadequate for providing an approach both to the docks and to the extension of the city. The provision for the traffic would be limited to the narrowest width, and I think it is about 50 feet; assuming that the Flinders-street extension passed between the boundary wall of the Gasworks and the frontage to my property, which, I think, is 90 feet.

2517. Suppose that Flinders-street were widened three chains all along the bank of the river, running along beyond the Gasworks as well, with a street running near the property you occupy, cutting across there, would that afford sufficient access to the new docks?—Of course my opinion must necessarily be provisional. I should think that, if those docks were largely devoted to the shipping and transit of goods by way of Flinders-street, that Flinders-street alone would hardly provide sufficient accommodation as an approach to the extended city and the transit of goods from the docks. Perhaps, in other words, it may be said that Flinders-street would be adequate if wholly occupied by the transit of goods from and to the docks alone.

2518. Suppose that the traffic in Flinders-street were eased by the construction of a steam ferry across the Yarra in front of the Gasworks, and Latrobe-street were opened to the docks, would those two additional means of transit, together with Flinders-street widened, give sufficient means of access to the docks?—No. Do you consider it necessary to the plan of the extension of the city westward to have a direct approach?

2519. The extension of Latrobe-street runs directly on to the docks—[showing and explaining a plan to the witness.]—Looking at all those methods of access to the docks, would they be sufficient without taking any of the land of the present station yard?—Is this the area of the so-called Woods' docks?

2520. No, that is Coode's?—I am not familiar with that plan, but it appears to me that Latrobe-street, the extent of its area, would be a very convenient approach and additional to the extension of the property of the Government, and I think the Government would be very glad to have their property extended at the south side of the docks.

2521. The Government would be very glad to have access to their property by way of Latrobe-street?—Yes, that is the area.

2522. But the extension south is the extension to the east of the docks, between your property and Spencer-street; that land, it is suggested, should be taken from the station yard and dedicated to streets and building purposes?—I think that the Railway Department occupied this, and that the exigencies of the department were paramount to the other, undoubtly I suppose, without committing myself, because I have no theory in regard to it.

2523. If all the railway authorities say it is absolutely essential for the proper working of the railway, what would you say?—Then it becomes a question of how the approaches to the docks can be made.

2524. I will again show you that on the plan. Would not all those methods of extension, as well as the establishment of a steam ferry near the Gasworks afford sufficient access to those docks?—If the railway station was moved northwards, and this land left free for the erection of all those indispensable appliances for coal and timber merchants, stores, and grain, and so on. I should imagine that this area would be very valuable for that purpose, unless provision were made on the north side of the docks.

2525. Then I gather that you do not approve of taking the railway land away for any other purpose than that?—I assume that if the railway station stopped at, say Bourke-street, that the extension of Bourke-street itself would be a great convenience so far as the general interests of the extended city and docks are concerned.

2526. How would the interest of the country be considered by putting the station further away?—I am not familiar what the great men were or that—assumed the extension of the city and the railway. I think there would be a consensus of opinion that as many approaches to the extended city and docks as possible should be made; we should not attempt to limit it. If the extent of the land was favorable, and there were no conflicting interests, I think we should agree that it would be very desirable to have all those streets extended westward.

2527. Of course everybody thinks that; but your notion, as to the city, is to extend northward of the docks?—No.

2528. The only part sought for by the city is the part where you say there is no space?—Only for the purpose of making approaches.

2529. No; making streets through, and disposing of the land for other purposes?—In the interests of the country, I suppose the corporation does not propose to appropriate the funds realized, but do you consider it necessary that the two railway systems should be joined by this viaduct?

2530. Should it be done in your opinion?

2531. You are familiar with the area of land occupied by the railway at Spencer-street?—Yes.

2532. Do you think that if the Railway Department had its land entered at Spencer-street, but increased in the immediate neighborhood of other streets that it would compensate for the loss?—I am not clear what you mean.

2533. Suppose the land adjoining other stations from whence goods are distributed were increased in area, and at the same time the main station ground of Spencer-street were diminished in area, do you think the one would counterbalance the other?—It depends somewhat on the extent of land available in connection with the other stations—take the large area which appears to me to be available between Prince's-bridge and Spencer-street; I think it is about 300 feet in width, on boundary being Flinders-street and some other street. I should have thought that a large area like that, extending for such a considerable length, might have been utilized either for goods or passenger traffic; but supposing that the station were approached no nearer to the southward than Bourke-street, and the viaduct was capable of conveying the whole of the passenger traffic from the eastern suburbs, it appears to me, then, that the goods being here, and that very large area being available for the uses of the department, the whole of the passenger goods traffic would be provided for. Moreover, I think the department has applied to the City Council for the cession of a portion of the park where the corporation baths are, and I am under the impression that there was an area given to the Railway Department for the accommodation of the goods traffic as part of the MELBOURNE EXTENSION.
Prince's-bridge; that would be a very large area, especially in connexion with the area I have spoken of, and in that case the passenger traffic might be at the end of Elizabeth-street. But there are some objections to that, the details of which I am not acquainted with, which perhaps makes that an objectionable proposal.

2334. The Railway hold now about 150 acres of land down on the swamp here and to the north of the present station?—Yes.

2335. My question is, if that land was curtailed but their land increased in the suburbs where stations are likely to spring up as the city grows, would you consider that three areas of 50 acres each would be given to as this large area of 150 acres on the west side of Melbourne?—It is somewhat a large question; it seems to hang on the question of where should the traffic concentrate.

2336. Take your own premises—how much land do you occupy?—Three acres.

2337. Suppose two acres were taken away from you, and bits were given at other parts of the suburbs instead, what would you think of it?—I should not think it an equitable adjustment at all.

2338. Are you acquainted with the size of some of the large stations of London?—Yes.

2339. Do you know the size of Cannon-street station?—Yes, I stopped at the Cannon-street hotel, so I am familiar with that particular station.

2340. Would you call that a first-class passenger station?—I should think it one of the busiest stations you could have, except the Great Northern.

2341. Would you consider that station equal to do the work of Melbourne?—I think it would. I am not seized of the dimensions, but I think it would accommodate the traffic of Melbourne.

2342. That station is about three and a half acres?—Yes, I dare say that would be somewhere about it.

2343. If three station yards of fifty acres each were distributed round Melbourne—in fifty years' time—when the population and business have increased; would it not be a greater advantage to Melbourne than 150 acres in the present position, where all the traffic would have to be centred in the 150 acres?—That is really a question, as to where the traffic would concentrate.

2344. You say you know the Cannon-street station?—Yes.

2345. Do you think it would be a good thing if that station were increased in area from what you saw of it?—No.

2346. Do you not think it requires any increase of area?—It is a very difficult question; to me it appeared to be adequate.

2347. Do you know it is not a goods station at all, but a passenger?—Yes.

2348. Then how can you argue any comparison between this station and that one?—When I offered an opinion on the subject, it had reference to the passenger accommodation, and as to whether a similar area here would provide for the passenger traffic of the city, and I said it would.

2349. You did not take into account for goods as well?—No.

2350. You have noticed the enormous traffic here on race days?—Yes.

2351. Do you think a small station like the Cannon-street could accommodate the traffic on a day like that?—I should think so, but the reason for saying that is that so many lines run into the Cannon-street station. It is something like as broad as it is long and a great number of lines run into it and stop at this particular part.

2352. You know that passenger traffic, a station as broad as it is long is not desired—they have to be longer than broad to be of any use?—The number of lines running into it would somewhat modify that view. A curve takes place immediately after the signals at the exit of the station are passed but for the straight run in to the passenger platforms; there is adequate provision.

2353. Do you know how many principal stations there are in London?—No. I have only a general knowledge of Paddington, the Great Western, Cannon-street, and others.

The witness withdrew.

James B. Hutton, Esq., examined.

2354. By the Commissioner.—You make valuations of land on behalf of the Railway Department?—Yes.

2355. How long have you done that work?—I have been at this particular work for the railways for the last eight years.

2356. Were you accustomed to the valuation of land before you joined the Department?—Yes, thirty-five years ago and for many years.

2357. Upon what particular lines have you valued land?—I valued nearly all the land at the time the Geelong and Melbourne Railway was made, and I have been in the habit of selling the lands of the colony. I believe more acres have gone through my hands than any one person in it.

2358. Have you made a valuation of lands within the last few weeks?—I have.

2359. What land does that cover?—What I was requested to do. This plan—"exhibiting the same"—was given to me to value—all the land occupied by the Railway Department from Flinders-street, as far north as Bourke-street, and between Spencer-street and the Gasworks.

2360. Have you shown the streets?—I have made estimate of it all.

2361. Have you taken frontages, and shown streets?—Yes.

2362. Will you name the streets you show on that plan as being extended?—There is the extension of Flinders-street to begin with, and the extension of Flinders-lane, and the extension of Collins-street, Little Collins-street, and Bourke-street.

2363. Both sides of Bourke-street?—Only one, the south side.

2364. And the north side of Flinders-street?—Yes.

2365. Do you show any streets intersecting those?—There are lanes intersecting them.

2366. What is the total frontage you have obtained by that?—£1,829 feet.

2367. Will you take each street separately, and give the valuations for each, and the price per foot?—I can give the total.

2368. It would like each street separately, and the frontage to each street?—The Flinders-street extension; the south side of it I give 1,038 feet.

2369. At how much?—At £250 a foot, the one frontage; it goes right through.
2570. What is your total for that?—£255,750.
2571. Is that for Flinders-street only?—Only the south side of the extension.
2572. What is the depth there?—It is through to the north river.
2573. The present road that is used for the traffic?—Yes.
2574. What is the depth?—100 feet. I then take the north side of Flinders-street. On the first portion of it I give 280 feet. I put that down at £70,000. If it be the same thing to you, I would rather give the portion that comes as far as where the proposed viaduct has to come, because that is the most valuable portion. I have divided it into three different sections for valuation.
2575. The next is Flinders-lane on the south side. The extension of that is 600 feet, taking the frontage only, going through. I do not count the frontage to the lane, but taking it right through, I put it at £165,000. On the north side there are 660 feet with a second frontage, that is £165,000. The south side of Collins-street I give 800 feet as £280,000; and the north side 840 feet at £294,000. Little Collins-street, 80 feet as £212,500. On the north side of Little Collins-street, there is 850 feet as £205,000; and 850 feet on the north side of Bourke-street, as £212,250. In round numbers, as far as this proposed viaduct extends, there is 6,750 feet amounting to £1,724,750. Now I will give the next section.
2576. That last is not including the east of the viaduct?—Yes, east of the viaduct. On the next level, I begin up at Bourke-street extending west. On the south side of the extension of Bourke-street, there are 820 feet at £64,000; Little Collins-street, north side, 320 feet at £18,000; Little Collins-street, south side, 320 feet with the other frontage given in, £24,000; then comes Collins-street, on the north side, 320 feet, with a second frontage, £26,000; and on the south side of Collins-street, with a second frontage, 550 feet, £76,000; Flinders-lane, north side, 450 feet, with a second frontage, £27,000; Flinders-lane, south side, with a second frontage, 460 feet at £60,000; Flinders-street, north side, with a second frontage, 520 feet, at £18,000. That is a total of 3,070 feet, at a valuation of £388,500. Now I come to this lower level, which is described as just 16 feet above low water mark, down next the Gasworks. They are irregular, but it can be so far extended that there will be 2,000 feet of frontage available for sale on this lower level, and I put that down, because they will have great depths for warehouses, at £100 a foot, making £200,000. The grand total is 11,853 feet, valued at £2,518,259; and in the course of five years, if the city is extended there, I estimate that it will be worth double that.
2577. Did you calculate the area of land altogether with the streets and land?—No; I simply took the frontages of each block. I likewise made an estimate of North Melbourne, which I was asked to do—that is, the purchase of the land, provided it was extended. Of course I had very little time to do this; it is merely approximate. I went through every street and examined every piece in it; but, of course, this is a thing that would take months to do properly.
2578. Never mind frontages there, but tell us how many streets would be closed altogether by the purchase of land, and what is the total amount of money that would have to be paid for this purchase?—My valuations of all those blocks, with the buildings on them at present, is £902,475; in round numbers, a little over half a million.
2579. What area does that comprise?—I do not know what the area is.
2580. I mean what are the boundaries of the area?—I just went by the plan submitted to me by your secretary.
2581. When Mr. Speight was here, he stated that if they were deprived of the area on the south side of Bourke-street, they should require to obtain the land situated between Latrobe-street and Roden-street; but you have gone much further than that. I have only gone to the extent the secretary told me.
2582. Can you give the value for the land between Latrobe-street and Roden-street separately?—Yes. You mean everything west of Hawke-street?
2583. Yes?—It is only that one block that would be expropriated—[Looking at the plan]—Latrobe-street, a portion of it; Jeffcott-street; Franklin-street; Dudley-street; Roslyn-street; Stanley-street; Roden-street; Hawke-street; west of Ireland and Alderley-streets.
2584. If that land were purchased for railway purposes, Latrobe-street could not be extended, nor Dudley-street?—Latrobe-street could not be extended, and Jeffcott-street would be blocked, and Dudley-street would also be blocked.
2585. Your plan shows the opening up of certain streets; the alternate proposal of purchasing land shows the closing of certain streets?—Yes.
2586. That plan shows that the two streets that most of the witnesses have advocated as good for opening to the docks would be blocked entirely?—Yes.
2587. Are they not blocked at present?—Yes, they would be blocked as far as Spencer-street.
2588. They run up against the railway fence?—Yes, they are just now blocked as far as that goes. You said just now it would block Ireland-street; now Ireland-street does not come in at all, if you limit the area that you have valued to Roden-street?—Yes, I take all on the west side of Ireland-street; but, of course, if we stop at Roden-street we do not reach that.
2589. Then the answers must be affected by that limitation, if you only go to Roden-street?—If you only go as far north as Roden-street there will be a large sum to be deducted from my estimate.
2590. Mr. Speight, in his evidence on this point said, “We should have to go to Hawke-street”?
2591. That is four streets farther.
2592. In that £900,000 you take the present value in your idea of that land?—Yes, land and buildings.
2593. Have you taken into consideration the price that people would ask if the Railway Department wanted it?—I put something on for compulsory taking.
2594. What percentage?—I did not go minutely into that. I took block after block, and valued the buildings in my own mind—I had only a few days to do it.
2595. As a matter of practice, what do you allow for compulsory taking?—From 20 to 25 per cent, sometimes 30 per cent. It depends on the properties.
2596. Have you put on that percentage in this case on any?—I did not put it on in the percentage at all. I took block after block, as I thought.
2597. Had you compulsory purchase in your eye when you put the value on?—Yes. I fancy a little over half a million will buy the lot of it.
2598. Compulsorily?—Yes.
2599. In order to make matters clear, I should like you to give us in round numbers your valuation of the land north of Roden-street?—That is seven blocks. I estimate that at £110,000.

2600. That is the land north of Roden-street?—Yes, entirely north of Roden-street.

2601. You have made no calculation, I suppose, of what it would cost to make that area available for traffic or for the working of the railway as the ground now used for it?—No, I did not take anything of that kind.

2602. You know that whole area is a higher level than the railway level?—I did not take much notice of the levels; but I believe it is higher.

2603. You have been valuer for the Department for the last seven years?—Yes.

2604. Were you not also a director of the Geelong and Melbourne Railway?—I was.

2605. Have you any knowledge at all of the requirements of the Melbourne station?—No, I have never gone into a matter of that sort, not being a professional.

2606. From the knowledge you have, would you think it advisable to put this land for the purpose proposed?—I would rather not answer that question, because I have not gone into it.

2607. What is your opinion?—I have never studied it, to tell you the truth. I have been too much occupied up the country and about to think about the matter.

2608. You said this land, which would fetch two and a half millions, would fetch five millions in five years?—Yes.

2609. According to that, would it not be better to keep it that time, and then sell it?—It is the progress of the town westward that would enhance its value as the streets were built on. With the buildings going up in the course of five or six years, it would be worth five millions instead of two or a half.

2610. How have you arrived at the valuations of these frontages round here—what have you been guided by mostly?—I have done it just out of my own head. I have not had any one else with me in these questions, or taken the opinions of any.

2611. What I wanted was this—have you been guided by the recent sales in the vicinity?—I have to a certain extent.

2612. Do you consider it necessary that the two stations should be connected?—I think it would be a very desirable thing to have them connected.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow, at Two o'clock.

FRIDAY, 27th MAY, 1887.

Present:

The Hon. A. J. Tucker, M.L.A., in the Chair;

The Hon. F. T. Sargood, M.L.C.,

W. Maiden, M.L.A.,

W. Cain, Esq.,

J. Lawrence, Esq., M.L.A.,

A. J. Skene, Esq.,

The Hon. N. Thornley, M.L.C.

Thomas MacPherson examined.

T. Macpherson.

2613. By the Commissioner.—What are you?—I am a merchant; an iron merchant.

2614. Where is your place of business?—Collins-street west.

2615. What is the nature of your business?—Iron and machinery merchant.

2616. How long have you carried it on?—Twenty-nine years.

2617. You use the railways to a considerable extent?—Yes.

2618. Both in the importation of goods and sending them up the country?—Yes.

2619. Have you noted a proposition that has been made to move the station from its present site to one north of Bourke-street?—Yes. It is about twenty years ago since I took an interest in this movement, and the idea at that time was to carry the station north of Bourke-street.

2620. What was the view?—For allowing Collins-street and Bourke-street to be extended to the river.

2621. Not in connexion with any dock scheme at that time?—No, there was no dock scheme. The only scheme at that time was a direct canal. Both sides of the canal were supposed to be vlarisation accommodation for the shipping.

2622. The object then merely was the extension of streets and the selling of the land?—Yes, by opening up the west.

2623. With the view of extending the city?—Yes.

2624. And erecting warehouses on each side?—Yes.

2625. Was it twenty years ago?—Yes, it would be about eighteen or twenty years ago. I think the Hon. T. Leader was chairman.

2626. From your experience of twenty years, do you think a different phase has been put upon the subject altogether now?—Yes, I quite approve of the carrying the station back beyond Bourke-street, and extending both Collins-street and Bourke-street west to a clear line across the river.

2627. At the time you speak of, Brunswick Hill existed?—Yes.

2628. Was it a proposition that the hill should be cut down?—No, I do not think so; simply a continuation of Collins-street. I do not think the hill come into consideration.

2629. The object then was not to reach the river or the wharves upon the river?—It was simply for the extension of these two streets and the city westward.

2630. Only two streets?—And the narrow streets, the chain and a half streets.

2631. Do you think now that such a plan is feasible?—I think so, and I think the cost of alterations would be covered by the reclamation of the land on both sides.

2632. Do you not think that the land is more valuable to the Railway Department than to the public?—I do not think so; not at all. My own idea is that there is sufficient land between Bourke-street and La Trobe-street for all the accommodation required for the railway for the next twenty years.

2633. Where is your place of business situated?—Collins-street west.
2634. Then the station would be situated further away from you?—That is no matter.

2635. I ask the simple question?—It would be...

2636. Would it make a difference in the expense of carriage?—I do not think so.

2637. Do you not think it would entail an additional expense upon the inhabitants of the country for all time?—I do not think so. I believe beyond Bourke-street towards Flemington will be the centre of the city in a short time; that is if the west end be opened.

2638. One of the propositions is, and in fact a very general proposition, that the railway should be reserved for railway purposes, and that the entire area of the swamp should be dedicated to dock purposes for the future; what do you think of the proposal?—I do not quite agree with it. You are blocked in on all sides; to the west you are as far out as the river, and northward you are built out as far as Flemington and beyond.

2639. There is plenty of room to spare now, is there not?—Certainly, if you go beyond Flemington. You see Collingwood is out to Mordialloc. You want the west to extend down to the river.

2640. How much would this opening up cost altogether?—If the original scheme had been carried out, making a direct canal, the idea was to close up the Yarra and take up the whole of the land down to Sandridge.

2641. That scheme has not been carried out?—No. I gave you an idea of the original scheme.

2642. Under the present state of affairs, how far should Melbourne be extended now?—I would extend as far as you can.

2643. Say down to the new docks?—I have not studied that; that plan is the first I have seen of the proposed docks.

[A plan was produced and explained to the witness.]

2644. The Willamer. I do not see any other way that to take those streets down to the docks.

2645. Collins-street and Bourke-street?—Yes, and Flinders-street.

2646. That would take away 50 or 60 acres?—Yes, it would simply take away 60 acres from the Railway Department.

2647. And, having done that, the extension of the city must stop, must it not?—Yes, unless you close up the Yarra at the entrance to the new cut; if you do so you carry it down further.

2648. In that case how would you get in with your docks?—The docks are, I presume, up above the Gasworks.

2649. You see that plan upon the wall?—Yes; that is above the middle of the cutting. You see there is nothing to hinder its being closed up down to the Saltwater River; then you can carry out your reclaimed land all the way down to the Saltwater River by shutting off here.

2650. Shutting up the Yarra?—Yes, the old channel.

2651. It has been provided by an Act of Parliament, after sufficient consideration, to keep the channel open?—Yes, it would require a new Act.

2652. It is essential to keep that open to keep a certain depth of water in the river?—Of course, the wisdom of Parliament is final, and so we need not discuss that point.

2653. Is it looked upon as a refuge dock, a refuge for small vessels?—Yes, but you close up a large extent of land there.

2654. Do you know that it was also a part of Sir John Coode's scheme to keep that open?—No; I was greatly disappointed in that scheme of Sir John Coode's, after the expense that was gone to for the original scheme.

2655. Your idea is that Melbourne should extend westward?—Yes.

2656. And that the limit of the extension should be 50 or 60 acres up to the new dock?—Yes; and if you close up the Yarra at the new cutting, that would give you a large amount of land beside.

2657. Do you think the block of land beyond the dock will ever be occupied by large warehouses?—I think so, in course of time.

2658. Would not goods be brought up from the docks to the city?—It would be be greater distance to take goods there than to Swanston-street.

2659. Is it not taking goods away from the population instead of towards it?—But if the extent of land was populated.

2660. But it is not?—I speak of the future. I presume it will be.

2661. You do not think that the population there will ever be in any way equal to the population to the east?—Of course there is not the extent of country.

2662. The Commissioners of Railways and every authority connected with the management of the lines say that it is essential that this land should remain the property of the Railway Department to be devoted to the use of the Railway Department only?—I do not see it so. I think there is plenty of land you can reclaim for railway purposes without at all interfering with the extension of Collins-street and Bourke-street.

2663. At any rate, your proposal means putting the station further away than it is at present from the population?—I do not think so. I think there is more population beyond Bourke-street than there is to the south of it.

2664. Take all the population to the south of the Yarra, is it not further away from them?—There is the Flinders-street station, that being the south side.

2665. What about the carriage of goods?—A large quantity of goods is taken to the Hobson's Bay station every day; fully as much as comes up here by rail.

2666. Sea-borne goods chiefly?—Sea-borne; and then there is the Yarra on both sides. Now if it is not done now it will have to be done in course of time, when the expense will be much more than at present.

2667. You propose to sell the land thus along the line of the streets, if produced?—Yes, that is the idea.

2668. Now the Chairman of the Railway Commissioners says that he is almost certain that if the land were disposed of, the Government of the Department would have to re-purchase it in a very few years to come?—I would not like to put my opinion against that gentleman's, because, in one way he is far better acquainted than I am with the London stations. But there is not a station in London set out of it half the size of the present so far as my eye can judge.
2669. Is not that because they cannot get more land?—Yes. Of course I give way to that gentleman’s opinion, because his experience is great, and mine is limited.

2670. You see our railway system is very large. This is the terminus of many thousands of miles of lines, and these railways are increasing every day upon the Australian continent. This being the terminus now, do you think it wise to part with that land which is required for the docks and those railways for a mere money return?—No doubt at some future day there will be a station at the east end of the city, to take the traffic there, the same as there are in many of the large trunks in Great Britain.

2671. Have you any experience at all in railway matters?—No, I cannot say that I have, only by observation.

2672. You say you would not put your opinion against that of the Railway Commissioners?—Certainly not.

2673. Suppose you were a member of this Commission, having formed that opinion, and the Chairman and all the Commissioners, and all the railway authorities told you it would be a suicidal act to part with the land, would you be prepared to submit to that?—No, I would be very careful before I gave my decision whether I should go against his opinion or not.

2674. You would feel somewhat shaken, I suppose?—I should say so. I should say his experience has been great and mine is not.

2675. Do you consider it would be imperative that the two stations, the Flinders-street Station and the Spencer-street Station should be connected by a viaduct or otherwise?—I do not think so with the communication we have now by tramways.

2676. But you cannot take goods that way?—No, but cartage is cheap now.

2677. What about cattle?—That is rather a difficult thing, to bring cattle. Of course, they have to be brought from the other line to this.

2678. That is it?—Yes. Is not the present scheme working well that you have now along Flinders-street for railway traffic?

2679. You are aware it is proposed to build a viaduct between the two stations?—Yes.

2680. Could the traffic go over that?—Yes.

2681. Suppose those streets were opened, and you were bringing some machinery that you have imported, and had landed at the docks, and supposing all the streets were opened, and suppose that Flinders-street were widened to 200 feet along the river, and at that part where it is too narrow at the present time at the foot of Spencer-street, which road do you think your men would take in bringing heavy pieces of machinery to your store?—I think the gradient would be so very small down to the river that they would take the nearest—I suppose Collins-street. They would not avoid coming round by Flinders-street and up Spencer-street.

2682. Do you know the grade of Collins-street if extended?—No.

2683. One in twenty, I believe?—From here down to the wharf?

2684. Yes?—I should say it is one in twenty to get down to Flinders-street from here. You would have to come up Spencer-street or King-street.

2685. That would be a much shorter distance?—This would be a direct road.

2686. Would it not be much shorter to come along Flinders-street, and then pull up hill to your place; is it not in King-street?—No. They are much about the same, Spencer-street and King-street.

2687. Then do you think that either Collins-street or Bourke-street would be used as against Flinders-street for the carriage of heavy goods?—I think Collins-street would.

2688. Notwithstanding that heavy grade?—I think the grade is heavier from here to Flinders-street.

2689. You suppose that goods are going a short distance?—You asked me the question about my goods coming from the river. They come along Flinders-street and up Spencer-street into Collins-street. I say, if they were landed and this street open, they would come direct from the wharf up Collins-street; that is, if they are discharged upon the rail south of Collins-street.

2690. That would serve only warehouses round about your quarter?—No, I think it would take in the whole.

2691. Take places in Collingwood, Fitzroy, and Richmond, and those places—how would the traffic go in then?—I suppose they would go up Elizabeth-street and up Latrobe-street. That would be the easiest course.

2692. Now suppose that the land spoken of in this inquiry were kept for the Railway Department, do you think that the access provided to the docks by widening Flinders-street, the extension of Latrobe-street and Dudley-street, with a steam ferry across the river, nearly opposite the Gasworks or therabouts to relieve the traffic, would be a sufficient means of access to the docks?—At present it would be, but I think in the course of time it would become too limited for the traffic.

2693. Are you aware that Collins-street would not touch the docks at all if extended?—I think so—[The witness explained his meaning upon the plan].—You see, Mr. Chairman, there is a road to the docks, and they would take the nearest road to this street, Collins-street. They would never think of coming down Flinders-street.

2694. I understood you to say that twenty years ago you first took the view that the south side of Bourke-street should be used for the purpose of extending Collins-street and the other streets?—So I did.

2695. And you seemed then to admit to the Chairman that Batman’s Hill was then in existence?—If I remember right it was not, I think so.

2696. Are you aware that it is twenty-three or twenty-four years ago since it was removed?—I should not like to say. It may be twenty-five years ago since the Commission was sitting, but as far as my memory goes, the hill existed at the time.

2697. Have you seen any timber stored upon those areas round about here upon the railway ground, firewood, and all those bulky articles?—Yes.

2698. Do you think they could be just as conveniently stored in other places?—I think so.

2699. You have had a good deal of experience in getting cartage done?—Yes.

2700. Supposing that the goods had come to you from some parts now immediately north of Bourke-street, would that increase the cost of cartage to your store in Collins-street?—I do not think so. I pay just as much to Swanston-street as I do from Collins-street up to my place, not above 300 or 400 yards.
2701. And I understood you to say that your place in Collins-street cannot be reached without travelling over some hill?—No, not from the south.

2702. That is to say, the point always sought to be made here is that Flinders-street is the great street to those parts, and that just because the street is level; but you say that, notwithstanding that that street is level, yet a hill must be ascended before the goods can be delivered to most of the stores in Melbourne?—The Chairman asked me about my own place.

2703. I say your own place?—Yes, of course.

2704. They must ascend either Spencer-street or King-street, both of which streets have pretty heavy gradients from Flinders-street?—Yes.

2705. Flinders-street is level?—Yes, that is the only level street we have.

2706. Would that be rather a roundabout way to reach your store in Collins-street west to come by Elizabeth-street?—I think it would.

2707. You said, in answer to the Chairman, that half a mile would not likely add to the cost. Do you mean by that to say that, because the station was removed north of Bourke-street, that that would actually remove it half a mile?—I did not say so.

2708. I knew you did not say so, but I understood you to say —?—It would take about twenty chains.

2709. I understood you to say half a mile would be neither here nor there?—Yes.

2710. By inference, it would lead us to suppose that you yourself estimated that the station would migrate half a mile from your premises?—No, not at all.

2711. Put it this way: each journey would be a mile, half the distance each way?—Suppose it was, that would not increase the cost of cartage.

2712. The Chairman asked you, would you limit the extension of the city westward?—No, that is a misunderstanding.

2713. I understood the Chairman to ask you, whether your views of extension were limited to that extension?—No, no.

2714. The Chairman.—I think Mr. Macpherson said that that was the limit of extension if the Yarra were not filled up.

2715. By the Commission.—Exactly; that bears me out. That seemed to lead to the inference that, unless the Yarra were filled up, there was no possible means of extending the city beyond this?—You cannot extend it beyond the river, can you, unless you put up a bridge?

2716. Exactly; but there is the West Melbourne Swamp. Does the witness object to the extension of the city, if possible, to other parts of the West Melbourne swamp?—You mean north-west?

2717. Yes.—I believe the whole north-west part of the city will be reclaimed in course of time, and built upon. With your extension, you cannot get farther than the river, the Saltwater river or the Yarra.

2718. In that direction?—Yes, in that direction.

2719. That is exactly what I wanted to bring out, whether you thought it might be possible and advantageous some day to extend the town or city north-west?—Yes, it would not take the whole of the reclaimed swamp.

2720. You have already answered the particular question as to what you might do if you were a member of this Commission. You said you would be very careful?—I would be very careful.

2721. That is, I understand, that even though you were a member of this Commission, and even though you were disposed to allow the utmost deference to the views of the Commissioners or Commissioners, still you would be guided not by your views, but by the evidence given to some extent by others?—And I would ask for information from home stations, the amount of goods taken both ways, inward and outward, the passenger traffic, and I would see the amount of space covered by home stations, and I would allow a good margin for the extension in our railways in course of time. That is what I would do if I were a member of this Board.

2722. Then I understand you that you would require actual official information upon those points before you would feel justified in committing yourself to any particular recommendation?—Yes, I would.

2723. You spoke about the distance; you were thinking of the passenger station, shifting it from the present position to one north of Bourke-street?—Yes, that is the idea.

2724. You say it does not cost any more to cart a lot of goods half-a-mile further than it does to cart a lesser distance?—No.

2725. Can you tell me at what point the enhanced value commences. Does it commence at three-quarters of a mile?—Within the city proper one rate of cartage is charged; beyond the city the extra cartage is paid for. You know where the city boundary is—Victoria-street on the one side, Flinders-street on the other, Spring-street on the other, and Adenbury-street on the other.

2726. But suppose you want to call a carrier off the street, who never worked for you before, do you mean that you would carry that load of goods for you a mile and for the same rate that he would for half-a-mile or a quarter?—In that case my carrier pays him. He is bound to find me carriage.

2727. But suppose you want to call a carrier off the street, who never worked for you before, do you mean that you would carry that load of goods for you a mile and for the same rate that he would for half-a-mile or a quarter?—In that case my carrier pays him. He is bound to find me carriage.

2728. But suppose a man who never worked for you before. Would he charge you the same rate for carting a ton of goods a mile as he would for carrying it a quarter of a mile?—He would charge me 2s. 6d. within the city boundary.

2729. No matter where?—No matter where.

2730. Would he take a ton from Spencer-street to the other end of Collins-street for 2s. 6d.?—I believe he would. The draymen tell me that the expense of loading and unloading are the heaviest item. A man who has nothing to do may go 200 yards more with his load if he gets quick despatch.

2731. But is it not 200 or 300 yards?—Well, say half-a-mile.

2732. The goods station, if this change were effected, would be more than half-a-mile away from its present point?—I do not think so.

2733. The passenger station might be only that distance, but the goods station would be pushed further back again?—Not necessarily so. It may be carried to the westward of the passenger station, and front Bourke-street.

2734. Even if you carry the goods station further to the west, you carry it away from the places of business?—Yes. That would be further away, of course; but that would not carry it half-a-mile.
2735. But though there may be this arbitrary way of fixing the charge for carriage in the city, is it not reasonable that people would charge more in the long run for the carriage of goods the longer distance. They must pay it somewhere— I speak now of my own experience.

2736. Do you anticipate that that rough and ready way of 2s. 6d. a load will continue as competition gets keener?— I do not know.

2737. Do you know the cost to different parts of the city of London from the docks?— I have to pay it sometimes, but I do not know exactly what it is.

2738. I may mention that it is so; there is a scale according to distance?— It may be so; but it is not so here.

2739. Is it not likely to become so?; will there not be a change before very long from charging 2s. 6d. to any part of Melbourne, and that arrangements will have to be made to charge according to the distance to be carried?— That I cannot say; but for the last 30 years cargo has been the same within those limits, and goods were more, but it was always the same within those four limits. Beyond that was always extra carriage.

2740. Take a case. You know where your warehouse is and mine, in Flinders-street. You would be charged by a carrier so much for bringing a load from the Hobson's Bay Railway Station, just opposite, as I would from Spencer-street?— Yes, and I believe you pay as much. You are mistaken; I do not?— I do not know that. My people contract to cart at so much a ton within the city, and according to that I pay. Whether it is from the wharf, or the railway station, or the Hobson's Bay Station, the carriage is the same, at a fixed rate.

2742. Then we have to understand clearly that, in regard to yourself, when you have got to deliver a ton of goods, say, at Victoria-street at the junction with Spring-street, you have not got to pay more than if it came to your store?— No, just the same.

2743. That being your own individual experience, do you happen to know if your case is that of many others engaged in trade?— Yes, I think it is so. It is the same with Morris, Roberts, and Meek, and I think it is the same with James McEwan and Company and one or two others in the hardware line.

2744. Is it a contract of that nature in which most carriers would readily engage?— Yes.

2745. If the merchants are so disposed?— Yes.

2746. The Chairman was asking you what might be demanded and insisted upon from some person, perhaps like myself, who went to a carrier and asked him to take a load a distance; you said you did not know?— I said I thought about 2s. 6d.; that seems to be the general thing.

2747. You said it would be the same thing—1s. 6d.?— Not 1s. 6d.; I said 2s. 6d.

2748. What is the rate you pay per ton?— It is according to the class of goods, from 1s. 6d. to 8s. per ton. Some I pay 3s. 6d., a ton for others 1s. 6d.

2749. Are we to understand, in that case, if a private individual went after a carrier and asked for a load, he would pay 2s. 6d., as against your 1s. 6d.; is that it?— Yes.

2750. What proportion, in your opinion, does that class of carriage bear to the carriage that merchants require to this place?— I think it is much more.

2751. You do not understand my question. Do individuals like myself require anything like the amount of carriage that you merchants do?— Certainly not. You pay 2s. 6d., where I pay 1s. 6d.

2752. For one man who wants a load of goods carried that way, merchants want a thousand?— Yes.

2753. Do you not think really that if a carriage was started in Melbourne, and said, " In future we will cart by distance, and we will do Mr. Macpherson's loads for 1s. a ton, and we will charge Colonel Sargood 2s. 6d., because he is further away, would not that be a more legitimate way of doing business, and a direction in which the business will tend?— I do not think so.

2754. Let me put out the tramway fares; they pay 3d. along Spencer-street and anywhere to Fitzroy?— Yes.

2755. Already an agitation is started to have penny sections?— Yes.

2756. Is it not likely that the carriage of goods will work in the same way as the carriage of passengers?— No. I explained that a man would sooner cart for me, and perhaps Colonel Sargood, much less than he would for you, for this reason: that he may be detained at your warehouse, and not be able to cart under a couple of loads a day, whereas at my warehouse or Colonel Sargood's we would do half-a-dozen. It is the loading and unloading of his cargo. When once a load is on, it is very little difference whether he goes half-a-mile further.

2757. Take the calumni again, who carry an immense number of people; would they not charge more for a greater distance than for a smaller one?— They are limited.

2758. The limit is so much a mile. If they go more than the limit, would they not charge more?

2759. They pay them by the time.

2760. In fact a fact, that the greater facilities there are for carrying goods, the greater the advantage to the public?— Take the passenger traffic; you are as well aware as I am that the most of the traffic of passengers is all above Bourke-street. The great mass of the people do not live in Bourke-street, or yet in Collins-street. It is all north and east.

2761. We have 20,000 or 30,000 at South Melbourne, and another large population at Prahran and St. Kilda; now add half-a-mile or a mile. Would they not have to pay so much every time for their carriage, or the carriage of their goods?— That may be fixed by law.

2762. It may be a very minute sum, but we see by the balance-sheets of the Tramway Company, £20,000 in three years the piece have been easily collected?— Yes.

2763. You have been in business thirty years?— Twenty-five or thirty years.

2764. You say this system of carriage has been in existence for thirty years; do you ever recollect such a time as when those engaged in carrying goods for such a proposition as the chairman has described, to be carried out in future?— Really, I do not remember such a case. There might be.

2765. You know nothing of it?— I do not remember it, having carried done all those years, and I do not remember it. I think I have employed only two or three.

2766. As a man of the world, and of some experience, you believe, I suppose, that the future will be not unlike the past?— I cannot say what the future will be.

2767. How long have you lived in West Melbourne?— I think about thirty-five or thirty-six years.

2768. In West Melbourne?— Yes.
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2768. Has the population largely increased to the north, taking Collingwood and everything else, Kensington, Flemington, and Brunswick—has it largely increased to the north of Bourke-street?—Yes, but not to the west.

2769. But to the north?—Certainly.

2770. You consider there is a very large population to the north of Bourke-street to be supplied with all the goods that come to the wharves?—Yes, to the north there is, but not to the south, unless you go over to the other side of the Yarra.

2771. And, of course, they have got the Sandridge wharves there?—Yes.

2772. You believe that the population to the north of Bourke-street, taking the whole range, Northcote and everywhere else, has largely increased in your time?—Yes.

2773. And do you think that all that increased population is supplied by the goods that come here to the docks and to the railway?—Certainly not—are. There is very little cartage to the interior now.

2774. It all goes by rail?—All by rail and shipping.

2775. Then even supposing a quarter of a mile distance of the removal of the station did occur, and the effect of that, which is one that you do not appear to believe, is that it would increase the cartage to the south; even supposing it were so, by parity of reasoning you would imagine it would benefit the north by bringing it nearer? I am only putting a case, and supposing it did increase the cartage to the south slightly, on the same principle, if applied, it would benefit a large population to the north, would it not?—I do not think so.

2776. Because the whole thing would affect it?—No. Do not ask a question, and then answer it. My idea is that you would get your cartage done within the city to any point for the same rate.

2777. You have told us that, but I put the position that if it did increase the cost to those a little further north, it would be passed on to those upon the north?—[No answer].

2778. I cannot understand that cartage would be the same all over the city, except to persons like yourself, who enter into contracts. Supposing persons like Mr. Laurens and myself, and he wanted his ton of goods taken half a mile, and I want a mile and a half, surely the man who takes my goods the longer distance would want more money than my friend would have to pay?—It is an argument I should not like to go on with, for I have no experience. But I know this, that if you go upon the wharf and hire a dray to take, say, a ton of potatoes from the wharf, and give the man no delay in getting them loaded or unloaded, he would charge you two and sixpence. That is his fare, as I know; but I have not had the experience of it.

2779. The loading and unloading in short distances is the important part of it?—Yes.

The witness withdrew.

Andrew Kerr examined.

2780. By the Commission.—You are a member of the firm of Halstead, Kerr, and Co.?—Yes.

2781. And have been in business for many years?—Yes, from 1859 in the timber trade, and before that contracting.

2782. You use cartage to a very large extent?—Yes.

2783. Do you contract in the same way as Mr. Macpherson mentioned?—Only in certain radiuses.

2784. Supposing you had to go for your goods half a mile further than at present, would you pay more cartage?—It is sixpence a load extra.

2785. That, of course, you charge to your customers, or a little more than the sixpence?—If we could get it.

2786. So that you disagree with Mr. Macpherson's argument in regard to it?—We pay about £120 in cartage upon the average every week, and if it is beyond a certain radius we have to pay for half a mile about sixpence a load.

2787. And I presume you charge your customers a little more the further away they are?—There is a little more percentage to put on, but not equivalent to what we have to pay.

2788. Have you watched the proceedings of the Commission, and the evidence taken before it in regard to the extension of the streets?—I have.

2789. And the statement of the Railway Commissioners that they require all the ground for railway purposes?—Yes.

2790. What is your opinion upon that subject?—I have watched very closely for the last twenty-eight years, being down every week between here and the Gasworks, and I think it would be a great mistake, and a loss to the public generally, if the department were to give up one inch of the ground. I am satisfied, from the growth of the trade, that they will require every inch from here to the Gasworks.

2791. You have travelled a great deal?—I have.

2792. And have seen a great many stations in other countries?—Yes, I have.

2793. And after seeing those stations and our stations and our requirements, you think the Railway Commissioners are right?—I do. I think it would be a great folly to throw Collins-street straight through for such a short distance as it could go.

2794. Do you think goods would be carried through Collins-street if Flinders-street were available?—I would recommend the carrying of Flinders-street through, for we are very much cramped.

2795. If it were made 200 feet wide along the margin of the river past the Gasworks?—It would be a very much convenience to us. We are at great inconvenience as it is.

2796. Have you found any inconvenience in the transport of goods to the south side of the river?—On account of the increased traffic we have to pay sixpence a load more than we used to do.

2797. What do you think of the proposal to construct a steam ferry opposite the Gasworks to take goods across to South Melbourne and Port Melbourne without crossing Prince's bridge or along Flinders-street?—It would be a great saving. It would not be any cheaper than the present route.

2798. In what way, then, would it be a saving?—You would get the timber direct from the stave down there instead of from the yard.

2799. You think that the present station is in a proper position, and should not be disturbed?—I do not exactly say that, but the ground between here and the Gasworks could not be better adapted for traffic requirements than it is at present, and the station not been there.
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Do you think that the two stations should be joined by a viaduct?—I would approve of it myself. I would have one central station.

Joining the two systems—the country system and the suburban system?—Yes; do away with this line in Flanders-street which impairs traffic to a great extent.

Then you think that the widening of Flanders-street to get to the docks, supplemented by the extension of Latrobe-street to the face of the docks, and the improvement of Dudley-street through in addition to a street running to the east of the Gasworks, past Flanders-street, past William’s Factory, and on to the docks, would be sufficient access to the docks?—I do. I think Latrobe-street would be the greatest advantage to the public, and especially to the timber trade north of the river.

The Latrobe-street route would suit your firm—would it?—It would, and all those beyond us; and not only that, but I am confident that in a very short time the corporation will stop us from taking timber up Elizabeth-street. It is getting worse every day.

You think the time is coming when certain landing may not be carried up certain streets?—It must come to that. The same in London at the present time—no timber can go through the city after nine o’clock in the morning, not till after five at night. Latrobe-street, providing a siding could be put in, and timber ships discharged at the docks, and the siding went to the docks, would save a wonderful amount of carting of timber through the city. It would go direct from there to the country.

Three-fourths of the timber required in the country would go away from Latrobe-street.—It would be a wonderful advantage to country consumers, and to the trade here.

The Railway Commissioners tell us that if we parted with those 50 or 60 acres of land here we should be obliged to buy a corresponding area further north, and we find that in buying that we should be blocking up Latrobe-street altogether. Now do you think destroying that means of access altogether for all time would be compensated by the sale of this land?—I think it would be a great mistake, and a loss to the public generally.

You think the blocking of Latrobe-street would not be compensated for by the sale of this land?—I am confident it would not.

You spoke of a certain radius within the cartage was made at a heavier price for your firm?—Yes.

Can you inform the Commission what are the boundaries of that radius?—We are near the centre of the city, being in Elizabeth-street and A’Beckett-street, and it extends to the Gasworks on the one side and Spring-street on the other; but when we get beyond Spring-street, then we have to pay 5d. a load extra.

Then you quite corroborate the evidence given by the last witness?—And as we go on to Richmond, we have to pay more still.

If I understand you rightly, you seem to endorse what Mr. Macpherson has stated, that within Victoria-street, Spring-street, A’Beckett-street, and Flanders-street, the cartage is even?—One and the same thing. In fact, if a drayman takes a load a quarter of a mile, he has the same as if he took it to the extreme by the Gasworks.

I thought that would be the case. Still your remarks seemed to lead to a different conclusion. As a matter of fact, I suppose your timber is sometimes landed to the south of the Yarra?—Yes, the bulk of it now; there is no accommodation to the north.

Does the timber that happens to be stacked to the south side of the Yarra cost you more to reach your yard, which is pretty far to the north, I think, it is Franklin-street and Elizabeth-street?—Yes.

Does it cost you more than the timber landed on this side?—Sixpence a load more than at the Gasworks. That is about 5d. a ton, I suppose.

I wish further to ask you, would any alteration of the site of the railway, supposing the station was sent a little further north, affect you in the matter of the cartage of this timber?—No, a little further north would not affect us.

That may be so, but that is not the question exactly that I am asking. Would it affect the charge you pay for the timber you now receive from the south side of the Yarra?—From the south side it would make a difference, but it would be counteracted from the north. You have it a little shorter one way and a little longer the other; the one would counterbalance the other.

You inform the Commission now that a good deal of the timber that comes to your yard is stacked on the south side of the Yarra?—Yes.

Do you say it costs you 6d. more than that which is stacked on this side of the Gasworks?—Decidedly.

My question is, would that charge be at all affected by the removal of the station a little further north?—A quarter of a mile I do not think it would, but half-a-mile it would.

I cannot see how the change of the site of the station can affect the cartage of timber which is stacked upon the south side. If we did away with this station altogether, would you have to pay a bit more for the timber you require to be brought from the stacks on the south side of the Yarra?—We do.

To your yard?—It would be just the same to the yard.

It does not affect the trade in the least whether it goes a few chains further north or not?—No.

The Chairman has put it that if the station is removed, there could be no communication with the stations or the docks, as I understand it, by Latrobe-street. That may be so, but I am not aware that any evidence has been given.

Mr. Hutton said so yesterday, if Latrobe-street was blocked.

But I understand that whenever communication is opened through Latrobe-street to the docks, whether the railway is there or not, it would be by a bridge, and would it be impossible to have a bridge over Latrobe-street?—Yes. Latrobe-street was connected with the docks, would it be the most convenient street for your purpose?—Very much so.

For your trade and all bulky trade to the north?—Yes, I consider it would be a great boon.

The witness withdrew.
Frederick George Miles examined.

2827. By the Commission.—Are you Town Clerk of South Melbourne?—Yes.

2828. Has your council taken any notice of the proceedings in regard to the extension of the streets of South Melbourne westward?—Yes, they have done so.

2829. How does your council regard the proposition that those streets should be extended and the railway station ground cuffed by the amount of land required for those streets?—At the meeting before last the council passed a resolution to the effect that the proposal for extending the City of Melbourne westward by continuing certain streets of the City of Melbourne, which would necessitate the removal of the Spencer-street station northwards, would not be to the benefit of the city.

2830. That is, the City of South Melbourne?—The City of South Melbourne.

2831. Upon what ground was that resolution arrived at?—That it was desirable to have the station, regarded as a central station, as near to the City of South Melbourne as it could be.

2832. You heard the evidence that it would not make much difference, if any difference, in the cost of carrying passengers or goods, pushing the station further north?—Yes.

2833. What do you think of that?—I think, as a general matter, it would affect the people of South Melbourne, but of course I cannot go into detail upon that subject.

2834. Would you think it would entail a higher price for the carriage of passengers and goods?—I believe that is the view of the council.

2835. Were you instructed by the council to oppose the proposal?—Yes.

2836. On those grounds?—On those grounds.

The witness withdrew.

Edward Clark examined.

2837. By the Commission.—Are you Town Clerk of the Borough of Port Melbourne?—Yes.

2838. How long have you been town clerk?—Twenty-seven years.

2839. Has your council come to any resolution upon the subject of the proposals put before this Commission?—Yes, there was a conference between the councils of South Melbourne and Port Melbourne, and the resolution that Mr. Mills read just before you was submitted to the conference, and they endorsed it as far as the question of the removal of the station went. The Port Melbourne council do not wish to interfere in the slightest degree with the question of any improvement in the City of Melbourne itself; but they certainly think that the removal of the station further northward would be a great public inconvenience.

2840. How would it affect Port Melbourne?—It would remove the station very much further from Port Melbourne. It would affect the question of the carriage of goods for one thing.

2841. Would not the people of Port Melbourne get their goods from the railway pier and from the town pier there?—The goods are carried from the town pier to the city, and if they had to go up country they would have to go a further distance of course.

2842. I cannot see exactly how it affects the people of Port Melbourne?—The anticipation of the people of Port Melbourne has always been that the railway accommodation certainly would be brought nearer to them than taken further away. We have always looked forward to the time when there would be connexion between the two stations, the one at Spencer-street, and the one at Flinders-street, and so far back as the year 1856 a movement was got up for the purpose of inducing the authorities at that time to put a bridge across the Yarra at Spencer-street, and the agitation was kept up for some years, and went so far that plans were actually prepared for the purpose. Of course there may be objections to a bridge at Spencer-street, but it was always thought that there was to be a railway, and the railway was not constructed, then a bridge would be a means of crossing goods and passengers more convenient and more cheaply carried. The Port Melbourne wish to endorse the action of the South Melbourne Council, and to support them in the objection to the station being removed further north.

2843. On the general ground of inconvenience and increased cost to the people of Port Melbourne?—Yes, decidedly.

The witness withdrew.

Adrien Charles Mountain examined.

2844. By the Commission.—Do you wish to supplement your evidence by any plans?—I was instructed by my committee to prepare a modification of the plan already submitted by myself.

2845. Is that the plan upon the wall?—No. With a slight alteration, that would give the information you asked for, as to the distance the line would be from Spencer-street if the grade of Collins-street was altered from 1 in 37 to 1 in 30. This is the only alteration. The suggested viaduct would be two chains and a half nearer Spencer-street, or eleven and a half chains instead of fourteen.

2846. What is the difference between the position as shown upon your plan and the position described in the Act of Parliament?—Seven chains and a half further back.

2847. In putting the viaduct in that position, what grade do you get?—One in 30.

2848. That is at Bourke-street?—Yes.

2849. And at Collins-street, what grade do you get?—One in 37.

2850. And for every chain you come closer to Spencer-street the grade gets steeper?—Yes, certainly. In connexion with this subject, I have here some lithographs (not put forward as emanating from the City Council or authorized in any way by that body) showing the practicability of connecting the scheme delineated on the plans already submitted by myself with the West Melbourne swamp lands, thereby improving their present isolated condition. A general idea of the extent of such a proposal may be obtained by reference to the portions of the map on the lithographs, of which I have brought several copies—producing and distributing the same.

2851. I see you take off a portion of the pink to the north as well?—I labour under the disadvantage of having neither seen any of the other plans nor of having heard the evidence.

2852. You take off a portion of this railway reserve?—A portion of the temporary reserve; but not where it is at present in use. That is in order to make a main road which will almost lead direct to one of the main streets in Footscray.
2853. But, as a fact, you deprive the railway, not only of 50 acres down upon the river, but also of 50 acres of the portion to the north of the docks? — Yes, about that. This would be only a suggestion showing the possibility of the scheme. At present the railway lands, both permanent and temporary reserves, and the docks together, as I said in my previous evidence to the Commission, effectually block all extension of the city, should that be desired, in a westerly direction; and unless a portion of the temporary railway reserve, as shown there, or some similar area of ground, is taken from it, it would considerably interfere with any intimate connexion in the way of extension with the city and the West Melbourne swamp.

2854. I notice that you say "temporarily reserved" over the red blocks. I am informed that that is a permanent reserve? — This is a replica of the only information the City Council has from the Harbour Trust and the Railway department. At the time of the plans, 1882, they were all marked "temporarily reserved."

2855. The city corporation propose that the whole area west of the docks shall be cut up and sold in blocks of 50 acres? — I expressly guard myself by saying that this is not an authorized lithograph at all. It has not been submitted before the committee in the same way that the large-scale plans were.

2856. Of course, if this plan is carried out there would be an end to any extension of the railway station, except by repurchasing land? — Of course, if you do not consider 50 acres a sufficient area for a railway station, that would be so. That is to say nothing of the North Melbourne land, where the railway possesses about 37 acres.

2857. I understand you to say that the main entrance to what is now, upon the other plans, yellow, would be by Dudley-street upon your plan? — May I see the plan referred to?

2858. That is it — [pointing out the same] — that would be the main avenue to all that ground? — It would also be accessible to the docks, the whole of the dock area. It would gradually work into the extension of Bourke and Collins streets, and also if a bridge were constructed it would be approached by the bridge at Latrobe-street, in addition to which a connexion could be made by the high levels at North Melbourne station.

2859. Then if those two roads at Dudley-street and North Melbourne station were carried out, it would really give you access to the whole of the yellow lands? — Yes, it would really connect Footscray directly with the city.

2860. And that could be attained without taking the 50 acres down by the docks? — You limit your means of access to the city to the North Melbourne station and Dudley-street and Latrobe-street, whereas my plan gives you other approaches to the city.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Thursday, the 9th June proximo, at Two o'clock.