1441. There is an absolute loss to the State on every passenger taken over that horse-road?—I cannot give the total loss. I only give the loss from Collingwood to Headingley. The loss from Collingwood to Spencer-street I have been unable to ascertain.

1442. What is your opinion of that roundabout line?—The whole thing is a question as to the time.

1443. Can the people ever be convinced with this present line?—Certainly not.

1444. It is a positive necessity that the State should abandon dragging people all round that horse-road and go straight?—Yes.

1445. Will you give Parliament any pause unless they do it?—Certainly not. I know people who have agitated for 30 or 40 years for the line from Headingley.

1446. Should there be one line constructed, or two?—For the Headingley traffic one line would suffice.

1447. There are two lines proposed, one to Collingwood and the other to Fitzroy. Should there be one or both of those constructed?—I would not undertake to say both should be constructed in these times.

1448. Will one line do?—would it settle the question finally if one were constructed?—The expert evidence says it would not be sufficient in time.

1449. In your opinion, both these lines are necessary?—Taking into consideration the future development of the traffic.

1450. You deem it advisable that the State should shorten the distance to both those centres to the utmost?—Certainly.

1451. And if it is to be done, are we to construct first one, and then, in a few years, the other, or would you prefer doing them both at once?—I would not offer any opinion on that. I can only say that our district would be benefited largely by a connexion.

1452. You recognise that two are wanted?—Ultimately, not at present.

1453. You think one will pay?—Certainly.

1454. Possibly both?—One would decidedly pay; I would not say both.

1455. By Mr. J. S. White.—Which would you pay less for?—If you were to construct the Fitzroy line and tie in the Headingley traffic, taking the expert evidence, I have no doubt that line would pay for a very short time, but again taking the expert evidence on the Collingwood line, providing for the Headingley traffic, that shows a gain right away.

1456. Your opinion is that the Collingwood line would pay right from the start?—If the expert evidence be correct.

1457. Do you believe the expert evidence that the Collingwood line would pay better than the other?—I do believe in the expert evidence, so far as it goes. Other schemes have been brought before this Committee which would bring a larger number of the population into one of the lines. If that is possible it may be that the Fitzroy line will pay better than the other line. I cannot say as to that.

1458. By Mr. Harris.—Which is the better of the two routes in your opinion?—If you are going to make one line only for all time and you intend that line to serve the largest population, I believe the Fitzroy line with a connexion to Headingley would do that; but if it is the intention of the Committee that two lines shall be built to the northern suburbs, one now and one at a later date, I should say the Collingwood line would earn a revenue over and above working expenses from the start; but the Collingwood line will never serve the portion of Fitzroy lying over North Carlton way.

1459. If one line only is to be constructed you would prefer the Fitzroy line?—Yes, from a national point of view.

1460. By Mr. J. S. White.—If a loop line was brought it from Clifton Hill would that not take the Clifton Hill traffic?—Yes.

1461. Was the line authorized in 1854 the direct line?—Yes; it went from the present terminals at Collingwood and joined the Richmond line.

1462. That is made to the east?—A little.

1463. Would that suit you better?—Much better than the present route, but if you are going to construct a line, we may make the best line that is possible for all time; I do not commit another blunder.

1464. How much shorter would it be to take the route of 1854 round by Collingwood than the route round by Royal Park, providing you land in Flixton-street?—I have no idea of the distance of that line. It was shorter, no doubt, but I cannot say how much.

1465. Did it not come in to the east of East Richmond?—Yes, a little to the east. The Collingwood station and the Richmond station are exactly opposite to each other. Holden-street runs right down to the Collingwood and Richmond stations.

1466. Your evidence is that you want a line, and you are not particular whether it is the Collingwood or the Fitzroy line; you want a line to Headingley?—That is it. We leave it to the Committee to say which is best, first, in the interest of the community at large, and secondly, in the interests of the district to be served.

1467. The interests of the colony will lose nothing by its construction?—I consider it will be again to the colony by wiping out some of the present loss.

1468. If it is going to pay working expenses and more than the interest, would you undertake, if there was a loss on working expenses, to pay that loss?—We are prepared, under the Railway Lands Acquisition Act, to enter into the guarantees therein provided for.

1469. You are for land?—Yes. The rate of interest on the land is calculated in Mr. M'Mullin's calculations or earnings. If you take that from it gives the line so much more to come and go upon.

1470. By Mr. Ceulen.—Do you know this proposed scheme to make a loop from Collingwood, south of Johnston-street?—I have seen it. That line would serve us.

1471. By Mr. Harris.—Some time ago a conference was held of the shires of Preston, Epping, and Whitliscum, and the town of Norwood, to consider various matters in connexion with the direct route; could you tell us how it was that the shire of Headingley was not represented at that conference?—They were represented at one conference held in the Norwood Town Hall, about two years ago. At this particular one to which you allude I was not invited, otherwise we might have been there.

1472. Do you know why you were not invited?—My own belief is it was because we were going to leave the matter entirely in the hands of the Committee. Our position is, that we do not come to the
Committee and say—"Give me the Fitzroy line; no other line will do us." We say, after taking all the expert and other evidence available, we shall be satisfied with your decision, whether it be the Fitzroy or the Collingwood line.

The civic indifference.

Stephen Somerville, sworn and examined.

1473. *By the Chairman.—Want are you?—Assassin lithographic printer. I live at Clifton Hill. I have been eight years in Clifton Hill, and five years in Fitzroy, thirteen years altogether in the district.

1474. Do you know these suburban lines that they are agitating for?—I have thought over them from a traveller's point of view. I use the train as much as I can get it.

1475. Living at Clifton Hill, where do you travel from?—Clifton Hill to Spencer-street daily.

1476. Have you to travel from Spencer-street to your business?—This side of King-street, half-way to Market-street.

1477. What difference would it make if there were a direct line through either Fitzroy or Collingwood to Flinders-street?—It would make the difference in a journey of about ten minutes to a quarter of an hour, and also enable me to go at any time I wished. At the present time, if I have a little pressure of business, say, at five o'clock, and miss the thirteen minutes past five train, I have to take the train or walk home; and in the morning it is the same.

1478. It is not the point of the distance, but the frequency of the trains!—Not at present.

1479. How many trains a day from Clifton Hill to Spencer-street?

1500. How do they run in the morning?—Very well to suit those people who wish to reach town at eight or nine o'clock; that is all the trains that are suitable in the morning.

1480. You think that a line more direct to Flinders-street would be more suitable?—I certainly think so. I reckon the present line is only a make-shift. Where it might suit me now in the mornings and evenings five days a week, if I were to sit at a different hour it would be no use. I am living in Sprengle-street.

1481. Which line would suit you best?—The Collingwood line would certainly suit me best.

1482. Would the Fitzroy line suit you if a loop was made from Northcote South to join the Preston line?—To run the trains backwards from Clifton Hill?

1483. How would that line suit you; that is the only connection, supposing that line was made?—I do not think it would be a very good connection as far as I am concerned.

1484. Of as far as the Clifton Hill people are concerned?—I do not think it would be very suitable to them.

1485. Do you ever use the trains now?—I have to in the evening. There are no trains at night coming to town or going home. The trains cease running. The last train to Collingwood is a quarter past six, and from Clifton Hill to city at ten minutes to seven. At certain hours of the day I have to use the trains, because the trains only run every two or three hours.

1486. In a matter of ten, fifteen, or twenty minutes a matter of great consideration to you?—Often a matter of great consideration. I often wish I had a pair of wings that I could land myself somewhere in ten minutes' time.

1487. Is your occupation so valuable that the waste of so many minutes is of importance?—I have often had an occasion that a few minutes was very valuable to me.

1488. Your business must be a good paying business?—There are not many good paying businesses going on, but sometimes an hour is of value.

1489. I see you have a manuscript there; do you wish to make a statement?—If the Committee would permit me. I have a statement written, and it will not take me long to read it.—[The witness reads the following statement:—]

I, Stephen Somerville, assistant litho. printer, in one who has lived in the Fitzroy and Collingwood district for thirteen years, and who has carefully studied the question of railway communication with the northern suburbs since my arrival there, wish to say that I have always been surprised that there were not railways to convey the inhabitants to and from the city, more especially so because other parts of suburban Melbourne have been from the outset so well, accommodated.

On my return, I looked into the question from a resident's and railway traveller's point of view, and since I have reason to believe very selfish motives have been brought to bear against the proposed railways: it was this selfishness that caused me to attempt to make some reply to certain newspaper correspondence, and then to inform myself of the actual state of other districts when they had the control of railways conferred on them. I found that the opposition came from Tram-way shareholders, and I thought it my duty to refer to that splendid system of trams, which are necessary for certain travellers. I asked myself the question—were the statements of tram people genuine, that direct railways would ruin traffic on trams to such an extent as to throw their liabilities on to the shoulders of the ratepayers? I came to the conclusion that the answer must be No, because the residents of the northern suburbs number 100,000, to say nothing of future increase, and when I considered the fact that when the tram system came into existence there were already three lines of railways in the northern suburbs well suited to those districts, being central in each locality, and while the population only numbered seventy and thousand inhabitants, the Tramway Company did not act as if they thought laying tram lines on the security of the municipalities because they would not get sufficient traffic, but they actually laid equally as many tram lines for that population as to what there is in the north suburbs, and they run them so frequently that the lines run right through to the north. So I will give a few reasons why there should be a railway connected the northern suburbs with Melbourne (Street)._11

11. But because there is an enormous population to serve, a railway should be given to the tram so that they could be carried quickly and cheaply to and from the city, besides the immense benefit derived through the facilities afforded to reach the various stations on the lines.

20th. Because the residents of the northern suburbs believe that they will make a railway pay well, especially if the fare is to be on the basis as charged in other suburbs: there being a great activity against the large factories there are for reaching the city. Constant (right through) tram railways finding it very easy to travel once and twice a day to the city and back, and you leave your clerical for no other reason than the cost of travelling to them. There are many who travel on trains about once a day, some in the morning, others in the evening, who are only waiting for some means to travel cheaply both ways, and so often as necessary. Again there are those who only travel occasionally on the trains, and that not willingly, but through necessity, not because they are too thrifty, but would sooner walk, but because they reckon they cannot afford to pay the tram Company any from 3½ to 4½ per week, and they will not travel occasionally, because they naturally say—"If I can do without riding one day, why not another? or, if I ride one day, I naturally feel inclined to follow suit another?" so they abstain altogether.
3rd. Because the railway authorities agree that the northern suburbs should have railways, that they would pay, that their experience is that population will come to a railway beside the present population, and that people use the railway to the station so that they might travel cheaply.

4th. Because, at present, it takes about an hour and twenty minutes to come from Heidelberg to Spencer Street station, the extreme end of Melbourne, when a direct line ought not to take half the time, and they would have a central station.

5th. Because the localities between Clifton Hill and Groundsborough are kept back for want of population, simply because people have not the means of getting to or from the suburban railway lines.

6th. Because, besides the opinion of the residents and the railway authorities, we have the result of the railways south of the Yarra of the facts that they had built railway lines when they only had a population of 30,000.

7th. Because the proposed railways will not injure the tram traffic to such a serious extent as to give any likelihood of having to be taken over by the municipalities. We ought to be at the back of expression now and, if not, from now to the time of completion of railway, perhaps three years hence, the tram traffic will increase to a large extent, then, of course, there should be a certain decline, but then we will expect a large increase, and be compensated very largely by the pressure of the railways; because it would not be necessary to run the trams so often in succession, and that other expenses would be less, but tram traffic then will still be for the many who travel to and from places on the tram routes where the railways would not run, at least for those journeys.

8th. The trams will not be thrown on the municipalities; the Tram Company will get a good profit by keeping them running, because the population in the northern suburbs is now 25 per cent greater than it was in the southern suburbs when they (the Tram Company) had equally as many tram lines in that branch, and, if they had any fear of the result, why do so? If they had fears then they should not have run the power of throwing the tram lines, with their building, to the ratepayers of the southern district, with its 25,000 less population in which case they would have built more tram lines in the northern suburbs, and there surely the 100,000 in the northern suburbs will not throw the tram lines and liabilities of ratemaking because of railways being made direct to the city.

9th. Because nothing less than two direct lines will accommodate the Whitleyton and Heidelberg lines, when we think of the 60,000 people in Fitzroy and Collingwood.

10th. Because the opposition to the lines is not selfish, and not churlish; because of the supposed intention to test, but to keep the northern suburbs with all their beauty from having more attractions, in case of these already left them, they may come back or others, and produce the district from whence most of the opposition. As to trains failure, I think the line will be of great use as it will make out, if they don't know it now, that they are doing a good thing. With reference to depopulating other districts, that much will not be necessary, and good times will keep them up as well as we.

11th. Because there is ample scope for improvement—from Clifton Hill to Heidelberg waiting is waiting to be built on. Therefore, I think the crease at present exists parts to be filled up.

12th. Because Collingwood has not ample tram accommodation; there is a large population to the east of the railway in Clifton Hill, not near a train, and there are no trains from Johnstone station and Queen's parade.

13th. Because the Prahran, Albertpark, Elsternwick, and Mentone people and others have practically a line to the city; they have hourly trains to Collingwood, then they have to get up and either take the tram to city or walk; sometimes they have to catch the tram, which is a long way, and returning the journey in from about five to twenty minutes to the city, and if the passenger comes from beyond Ferntree Gully, he has the satisfaction not only of going to the city by going back a portion of the way and taking a long circuit round, a journey of 7 miles from Collingwood, but he has to pay for all those miles of railway on the suburban line.

14th. If only one line can be built now or ever, Collingwood as the premier suburban city is entitled to that line because of its long stretches the distance from the city, its want of perfect train facilities, and because the proposed railway line will not parallel to any tram lines but in one opposite direction.

15th. Better for Fitzroy to wait a little if two lines cannot now be built thus to make a moat of its use by proposing to make any connections in the hope of getting all the lines with one line. Question not one of increasing value of property; it is one of railway accommodation—ready, speedy, and cheap. I consider the opposition of some municipalities as an exhibition of check more than watching the interests of ratepayers. Those who did not oppose thought it set of their province to give opposition which would have saved themselves from being laughed at.

16th. The objection was once formed to construct a line, and petitioned the Government accordingly. Their prayer was refused. It shows that the policy of the country was "national." C. H. James was the minister.

17th. I have known some who have left Fitzroy and Collingwood for districts where railways are cheap and ready. The Preston line is direct, though inconvenient, to Flinders street. Preston line runs to Collingwood, then back again a considerable distance to reach Spencer street, the limit of the journey. If Preston line carries more passengers they have more direct and frequent trains in daytime, and have night trains, which do not run from Collingwood.

18th. Have you based your calculations of the population upon my data, or is it from your own knowledge, or from the experts' evidence?—review to the expert evidence being given I hunted it up in the Public Library, and I took the figures given therein as authentic.

19th. You are more in favor of the Collingwood than the Fitzroy line; but suppose Fitzroy is built, would you be of use to the Collingwood people?—I have not to this extent it would be useless to us. Part of Collingwood would be near enough to it, but not the majority.

20th. If the Collingwood lines were constructed, how far from the west would people go to the line running over near Hoddle-street?—judging from what I would do, and have known others to do, I think they would go half-a-mile to a street.

21st. Do you know how far half-a-mile goes there?—Half-a-mile from the station would be, I suppose, to about Wellington-street.

22nd. Would not half-a-mile cover west of Smith-street? is there more than half-a-mile, or is there half-a-mile, between Smith-street and Hoddle-street?—I don't think there is half-a-mile to a street.

23rd. Do you think they would go east, or down to Hoddle-street, from Smith-street to come by Wellington-parade into Flinders-street or Prince's bridge?—I believe the most of the people would, certainly. A lot of people would not think of the 1½, and would sooner jump on a train, but the periodical railway ticket-holders would travel that way. Casual people would jump on the tram.

24th. What part of the city is the attraction for the Collingwood and Clifton Hill people: where do they work?—The most of Collingwood and Clifton Hill people travel daily to the city to work; they are employed all the time in the city. There are a lot of manufacturers in the city, too.

25th. Do you think the Smithfield people would prefer going to Hoddle-street to be carried by rail rather than to go to the Gertrude and Nicholson street and other tram?—The Smithfield people are mostly business people, and it does not suit them to lose much time, but a working man or a man going to build make up his mind what time the trains want that suited him and travel the nearest route. There is a difference between 3½, 6½, a quarter by rail and where you might have to pay many pounds by the tram.

26th. Suppose a line was constructed in a line with Young-street, how far east would the people come out of Collingwood to that railway?—They have not really of going to either Wellington-street or Hoddle-street, or how far in that direction?—I do not think you would get many from Wellington-street.
190. Would they not be coming nearer the city by coming to some station, say the Germaine-street station on the Young-street line, or further north than that, the next station to it?—That is certainly a point in their favour, but I think if there were some other way devised for the Collingwood line it would be better than the present one. I think it is a great pity that the Collingwood line, as proposed, is kept so far down on the one side of the city.

191. Do you know of your own knowledge that Collingwood would supply more people than Fitzroy?—I have only to go by the fact that the city centre of Fitzroy is so close to the city that there is only a probability of the people travelling. I believe many would travel, but there is only a possibility.

192. Which has the best accommodation by tram?—Fitzroy. I reckon the Collingwood people, as a whole, are not so well situated, because those people living about Randens-street, North-street, in that direction have to walk to the Johnson-street tram or to Clifton Hill.

193. Are not the people about Smith-street well accommodated by the trams?—Yes, they have a tram as often as they wish, but they are too costly to travel by.

194. The trams running westward would serve both?—Yes.

195. You have the Victoria-street—what we used to call the Simpson-street—tram; would that take the other end?—Yes, but when we take the number of people who travel on the tram, there must be a vast number of people who do not travel by them; what shall we do with those?

196. Do you think they would travel by rail?—I think a great many people do not travel by tram because it is too costly.

197. Is that the reason that they do not travel by the tram?—I know many personally who admit, though people do not like to admit it as a rule, that they cannot afford 3s. or 6s. a week.

198. Do the people of the southern suburbs travel often by tram and railway than they do in the north by tram?—Considering the fact that the southern trams pay and the railways return a profit, they must travel more in the northern than in the southern suburbs?—So the statistics say, and I take them to be reliable.

199. Have you any other objection to the Fitzroy line or have you anything else to show why you prefer the Collingwood line?—I think it would not be a proper thing to do to take the Heidelberg people through the districts intervening by the Fitzroy route, because they have always been closely allied to Collingwood.

200. That is to Smith-street?—Not to take them by the Fitzroy route.

201. In point of distance, I suppose, it would be about the same?—I do not think it would make much difference.

202. Do you think the people would object to the Fitzroy line because there is a longer tunnel?—I think it is a great objection. It has been held out to me, in the course of conversation, that people will not travel in a long tunnel; they will rather walk.

203. Where did you come from before you arrived in this district?—From Queensland.

204. Are you a native of Queensland?—No; I am a native of Ireland.

205. Have you seen any tunnels in the old country through large cities?—Yes, I have seen some tunnels—there are the underground railways in London, and others.

206. Was there any objection there, or any reason why there should be an objection? We want to try your faith in what you say?—The tunnel business has never affected me much either way. I only state that I have heard people say they would not travel in a tunnel. I do not say what I would do. If I lived in Fitzroy I would certainly get into the train and travel by it.

207. Suppose there can only be one line constructed, if any, and the Fitzroy line is chosen, do you think you would rather have this than without a southern suburbs line at all?—I think that it would be a great mistake, no matter what I would rather do. I think that this Committee has a very responsible duty to perform, and it would be a pay for future generations to look back and say they made a mess of it.

208. By the Hon. D. McLachlan.—Do you think the junction of the two lines at any point is a mistake?—I think the Maclachlan-street junction a great mistake, if for no other reason than this: Clifton Hill district, as in the past, has been severed from Collingwood. It used to be a part of Fitzroy electorate, now it is a part of Katoomba Boroughs, South Brunswick. If you separate it again people will look out for where they are.

209. Do you think the two lines are likely to be wanted during the next five years, that is for the requirements of the district will the two lines be likely to be necessary?—I believe the two lines have been a necessity.

210. Is that necessity still to continue?—I do not see why it should not.

211. You believe it the two lines?—Yes.

212. And you believe in going the shortest way in to Flinders-street?—That is why I object to the present line.

213. The whole of your neighbours object to the foreshore bend?—Yes.

214. Will they ever be contented with that route, even if the Department put on frequent trains?—They would still be discontented.

215. Is that the reason, the long distance round?—Yes, and another reason is it is a loss to the Department.

216. You have heard the time that it is to take as given by Fitzpatrick's evidence, which you have read, I presume?—Yes.

217. He gives it as three minutes from Grey-street, five minutes to the next station, and seven minutes into the heart of Fitzroy; do you think that will get caught of the traffic to make the line remunerative?—In my opinion it would. Of course it would not be necessary or run so frequently all through the day, but the Department would look to that.

218. This short time business will get the traffic, you think?—Yes.

219. You are a good deal among the young people and know that?—Yes, and the old people too.

220. The cost to a family man is very great?—That is what I find.

221. A man with five or six children employed in the city finds it very heavy?—Yes, and I know where people have married in our district, and the young couple have moved away for that reason.
1533. Speaking about the tunnel, it is to be lighted with the electric light, and it is open tunnel in the centre?—I was not aware that it was an open tunnel.

1534. The opening is about 54 feet square. Would there be any objection on the part of the people, if we used electric light, and electric door if the tunnel was lighted?—With an air ceiling, and, seeing that it is only a matter of only a few minutes they would be in it?—It is well lighted, but it is the expense.

1535. The Department says—"The tunnel commences opposite Grey-street, in the Fitzroy Gardens, and terminates at the north side of Gertrude-street. It is 680 yards long, with brick and concrete arch, and has, in the centre of Victoria-street, a ventilating chamber 30 feet in diameter. It will depend upon the nature of the rock and other circumstances how much of this work is carried out on the "cut-and-cover" principle. It is proposed to light the tunnel with electric light. Public Gardens.—The area proposed to be taken from the Treasury Gardens is about 14 acres, in a strip parallel to existing paths, and from the Fitzroy Gardens about 14 acres. The footbridge is provided over the railway cutting in the Treasury Gardens. In order to take as little as possible away from the Fitzroy Gardens, an overpassment is made upon Lansdowne-street 20 links wide by 11 claims long, as the remaining width of that street—66 feet—is considered ample for the present or future traffic in the locality." Do you think there would be any objection to that?—The objection of cost.

1536. But no objection in the travelling?—If you were going to build two lines, I have no argument against it.

1537. By Mr. Harris.—Do you fairly represent the Clifton Hill people's views?—As far as I know.

1538. How far are you from Clifton Hill station?—Not many yards, four minutes walk.

1539. And how far from the tram?—About twice the distance from the Clifton Hill tram at the United Kingdom Hotel, Queen's parade, on the Heidelberg-road.

1540. How far are you from the Fitzroy co-op store?—About three-quarters of a mile.

1541. Would the Clifton Hill people use the co-op store if the Collingwood line were not made?—I feel certain they would not.

1542. By the Chairman.—What are you?—Counsellor of the city of Collingwood, and have lived there more than 30 years—that is, at Albert Park.

1543. You are well acquainted with the surroundings?—Very well, with the whole district.

1544. How near are you to the Johnston-street tram?—About a mile and a quarter.

1545. You are nearer Victoria-street?—I am on Victoria-street. My place of business is in Victoria-street, and my residence is very near it.

1546. If a line were constructed parallel with Hobne-street, would you go by that line in preference to the tram?—Unanswerable.

1547. Why?—It is a question of time and cost. The tram would be so much cheaper and go much more speedily; there would be no comparison.

1548. How do you go into and out of town now?—By bicycle and tram; by tram if I do not ride the bicycle.

1549. Would you dispense with the bicycle if you had a tram?—No, I think it would be a question of which was the more convenient to my business.

1550. How often do you go in and out of the city?—Sometimes two or three times a day.

1551. Were you living there when the railway was proposed from the Richmond or Hawthorn line?—Yes.

1552. How would that line suit you now?—I think it would scarcely do now. It would take too long a detention at Oxford, to which we are not accustomed.

1553. You know where it crossed Victoria-street?—Exactly, where it would have crossed; it would go through my house in Victoria-street. I have jotted down a few remarks, if you will allow me to read them. I say here—[reading—]

SOME REMARKS WHY THE COLLINGWOOD LINE OF RAILWAY SHOULD BE EXTENDED.

1st. Because it is urgently required by the residents of Collingwood. People have been induced to make their homes in our city, believing that it would only be a matter of waiting a little while for direct communication by rail.

2nd. Because travelling by tram is much slower and a great deal more expensive, every part of our city being cut off from Melbourne.

3rd. Consequently, the people are necessarily handicapped against the residents of the southern suburbs, who have most complete connection by both tram and rail. The southern suburbs having their share of paying for the northern systems are entitled to, and believe they will get at the hands of the Railways Standing Committee, justice in this matter.—Indeed, the residents of Collingwood would be quite content for the Committee to recommend what they think the most suitable route, I am speaking now in a representative capacity.

4th. That the line already extends from the north more than half way through Collingwood, and the further extension to Melbourne is necessary to make the existing line a source of great profit to the Department. The property to be purchased by the Government is now at such a price as it is very likely to be, and, not more than $25,000 or $35,000 would be required to purchase all the land that is necessary in Collingwood. That is not allowing for sewerage. I am speaking now from the municipal valuations and quote their figures. Of course, it is to be added to that would be the land in Richmond, which comes to something like $27,900, not allowing for compulsorily taking, but allowing for that what would be probably a fair title, it would make a total of, say, $54,000. If I remember rightly, the figures before, on valuation were about $120,000, speaking from memory.

4th. Collingwood being one of the largest manufacturing districts outside of Melbourne. The population gradually increasing—about the last two months—while many other cities are decreasing, and a large part of land still available for building on, points strongly to the fact that nothing but the weed of a direct railway communication is necessary to make it the most populous city in the metropolitan area. It is nothing unusual to see not less, I should judge, than 50,000 to 60,000 people of a Sunday visiting the most beautiful spot in Victoria, Stanley Park. Those are big figures, but I have thought them over well before giving them. I have noticed the number of people passing a certain point, and I do not think it exaggerates when I say 30,000 to 40,000. And on Saturday afternoons, when a football match is being played in Victoria Park, there is often 10,000 to 12,000 people coming from various parts of the metropolis to witness it. On one afternoon recently the tram company ran no less than twenty extra trains to relieve the congested traffic, all of which were required. There is also the fact that very many thousands of our people visit the Melbourne Cricket Ground on Saturdays when matches are played or sports are held. And a large amount of traffic is carried to the seaside in summer; in that respect the southern colonies furnish a large proportion of the travellers.
So far as the route is concerned, Collingwood is satisfied with the one designed by the Railway Department. It is thought that a line suggested by the Are on 30th June, 1898, a copy of which I have had prepared, and now hand in, it even for the reason that we found the line connecting Heidelberg and Heidelberg West in a direct line with the route proposed by the Are, and North Fitzroy, also the branch to the new reserves and asylum ground would be more direct than the line they have. We think that is a better line than you have. "

1544. By the Chairman. — How far is that from Clifton Hill?—It is the same line to Kelly-street, while it takes in the new and Yarra Bend Asylum reserves, and then it goes on and enters the Heidelberg and Whittlesea lines.

1555. By Mr. Gourley. — What street does it run down in Collingwood? — It almost follows your line. It is practically the same as your line.

But, as I said before, there are matters that our people would be willing to leave entirely to the judgment of the Railways Standing Committee. A strong reason why the line suggested by the Are commanded to the community is the fact that it would complete the route of railway around the northern part of Melbourne. This system, as the Committee know well, is used with splendid results in London, and adopting the same system in Melbourne would be the beginning of a great improvement in passenger traffic on our railways.

The Collingwood route would cross three lines of trains only, and then at right angles, so that, as far as competing with the trams is concerned, I do not think we need fear much shock. We firmly believe there is no danger of the trams being thrown on the heads of the municipalities on account of any railway competition. I think the experience of the northern suburbs is sufficient to show that we need not feel alarmed about that.

I must draw the attention of the gentlemen on the Committee to some evidence tendered the other day, where it was stated that the departmental figure used in估计 of two proposed lines should have been reversed.

This evidence was, as far as privately authenticated figures show, quite in variance with fact. The statement was made that a profit was shown on one line and a loss on the other, and it was shown the figures should be reversed. I have examined Mr. Mathieson's report which he received from his officers, and it was shown that they should not have been reversed.

1556. By the Chairman. — That would depend entirely on the scope of country they took in?—No, because the figures were published, and it was also shown how those results were obtained for each particular line, and it was sought to be shown it was a mistake, but it was not mistaken.

1557. By the Hon. B. Metcalfe. — Show us on what basis you are going. You are merely contradicting a statement, but showing nothing? — That is all.

1558. You have the reasons for the one side; if you have any reasons show them to us? — I took their figures to be authentic.

1559. In a word, you say the facts that the others controverted are right, but it would be better if you had anything to corroborate the statement? — I cannot have anything better than the departmental figures.

1560. They show they traversed the lower feeding ground of the Fitzroy line, and credited it to Collingwood? — Yes.

1561. They took the streets and said — "Crown streets are nearer to the Fitzroy line than the Collingwood line." If you can strengthen your ground, do it now. The Department said certain streets should come to Collingwood; then the Fitzroy people came and said the streets were nearer to Fitzroy. If you can show us that the Fitzroy people were wrong you will have gained a point. They took the map and showed that it was wrongly compiled? — I do not think you believe that. I have not the papers with me showing how the reports are made up, though I have them at home. I would be very glad to come before you later on and bring the papers.

1562. They said such and such a point should come to Fitzroy instead of going to the other line? — I understood the report that they said a profit should have been shown on one line and a loss on the other.

1563. It is not the money; it is the distance? — I believe eight out of ten persons would believe it as I did.

1564. By the Chairman. — Supposing the two lines were estimated, which would the Smith-street people go to, Young-street or Hoddle-street? — The actual Smith-street people would go to Young-street I should think, because it is closer.

1565. You see that the Department took the whole of Smith-street for the Collingwood line as a feeding ground? — Did they take both sides?

1566. I am not sure? — In that case it is a very difficult matter to lay down anything like a hard and fast line.

1567. It would appear on paper that the people would not go to Hoddle-street if they had the other station? — No, they would not.

1568. We must deduct a certain number from the Government estimate? — Yes. I think I understand it now.

1569. Supposing there were a line from Young-street, how far would they go east, how far below Smith-street? — I do not think they would go below Smith-street because they would have to travel up hill, and the tendency is to go down a street.

1570. From Cambridge-street where would they go to? — I do not think they would go to either; if their time was valuable they would take a tram.

In stating areas of grazing grounds for the traffic, Collingwood line could fairly claim very thickly populated parts of North Richmond, East Melbourne, North Fitzroy, Heidelberg, Arundel, and the tapping of portion of Kew, including the large areas in asylum reserves, the sale of which has, I believe, been authorised by Parliament. I have brought the report survey plans from the Metropolitan Board of Works to give an idea of the density of the population, I will leave them with you.

1571. By Mr. Harris. — How far are the reserves from the Kew railway station? — A mile and three-quarters.

1572. And from Barker's road? — The nearer would be the Kew station, but that would never tap the population from the Kew reserves, not if there were a straight line for the northern suburbs.

It is not necessary for me to touch upon any of the engineering aspects of the case, beyond calling attention to the facts borne out by the unbiased departmental returns showing heavy grades, long curves, and very small tunneling, as compared to the railway proposals that have been made while the tramway is not.

If, after the Committee's completed examination, it can be shown that the building of a Collingwood line would plunge the colony into any further indebtedness without an adequate return, I am sure our people would be loyal and do whatever recommendation is sent by the Railways Standing Committee to Parliament. I have my people well. After a long time to public life, and I believe that is the feeling of the people.

1573. By the Hon. B. Metcalfe. — You know you have to guarantee the interest and you have not to buy the land as the people have to do on the country lines? — Yes, I understand that.
1574. Do the people of Collingwood understand that they will have to give this guarantee?—

1575. Do the people understand it is the law of the land, and it is necessarily a condition under

Parliament alters it?—I hope Parliament will alter it.

1576. Why would you whisper that Parliament should alter it if you thought the line should pay

from the first?—If it is the law I think our people would agree to it.

1577. There will have to be a guarantee; if you, as a municipality, have to guarantee the money for the

land, do you understand you are quite happy under those conditions?—No one believes in guaranteeing,

but our people would abide by what was fair in the matter.

1578. If you have an objection, as a representative of Collingwood, now is the time to state it?—

I would like to say here that I would not let that be a bar. I believe we would do our share.

1579. In connection with the northern line, I would point out that a station at the Melbourne Cricket Ground,

as shown on the map, would be a point of destination also for the suburbs south of the Yarra.

1580. By Mr. J. S. White.—Does it show to go to the end of the ground?—Yes, slightly.

When any sports were being held, and the fact that the Melbourne Cricket Club is about spending $10,000 or $15,000 to enlarge accommodation, chiefly indicates the necessity for providing the quick delivery of large bodies of people there to and from the ground and holidays. This shows that by constructing a station there the matter would, to

the extent mentioned, serve as a feeder to the whole metropolitan system of railways. There would be such a small expenditure in stations and maintenance on the Collingwood line as to render itself very favorably as a line to be constructed.

There is very little traffic on the town, as I am informed, west of Geelong-street, showing that that part of Fitzroy is very close to the city, within five minutes walking distance, and from information supplied to me today, there is a small amount of traffic on the town after seven o'clock in the morning. Then there was some mention made in former evidence about a conference held at Northcote, at which Collingwood was not invited to attend (I never heard of an invitation), or Heidelberg either, so that when it is laid up as an unnecessary decision, it will be borne in mind all the districts were not represented. Heidelberg, of course, was always in favour of the Collingwood line.

1585. By the Hon. D. McNeil.—Do you think both lines are wanted?—Not at present.

1581. By Mr. Harris.—A conference was held by Heidelberg and other places—can you tell me how it was, because Collingwood was not represented, or, if it was represented, or if it be?

I believe the reason why it was not represented at the last conference was because they were not invited, and I believe the reason is that because they would support their own line.

1582. Was there any previous conference?—Yes; I was at a conference in the Northcote Town Hall, called by the Northcote people. I believe Cumberlidge proposed that the route to be selected should be left in the hands of the Railways Standing Committee, as nearly as I recollect; my recollection is not, however, very clear.

1583. Will you just take this document and look at page 5.—Handing a document to the witness.—

and say what you have to say about the rival routes?—[Readings].—In comparing the Young-street with the Hoddle-street route, the following striking advantages possessed by the former must impress those making a careful and impartial inquiry, and the more searching and critical the inquiry, the more strongly does the immense superiority in the earning capacity of the Fitzroy route make itself felt. Mileage.—As already pointed out, the Young-street route is shorter than the Hoddle-street route to every station (see map). On the North Fitzroy and North Carlton sections the advantage is 1 mile 20 chains or a run of 3 miles 10 chains; on the Northcote and Preston section it is 60 chains, and on the Carlton Hill and Heidelberg section 15 chains on a 14-miles run. This saving in mileage capitalized at 11 1/4 per cent, would more than pay for the whole of the land required for the Young-street line. Gathering ground.—The Young-street route strikes right through the centre of the busiest and most densely-populated metropolitan area, tapping the heart of the traffic, and drawing support from both sides. It runs for over a mile with 350 yards of Smith-street, one of the greatest business centres outside of the city. The Hoddle-street route leaves the Yarra for nearly half its length—that is not so—being within 12 chains of it in some places. A natural barrier is therefore placed on its earning power which must tell very materially on the returns. The Young-street route is naturally a central trunk line with all its attendant advantages; the Hoddle-street route running on the extreme eastern fringe of the population to be served, and with a river on one side never could become entitled to that name, or do the work of a trunk line. Earning power.—Further evidence of the above fact we have only to contrast the stations on the two lines, and their earning power in lifting passenger traffic.

1586. By Mr. Creaven.—Do you know this route?—Mr. Renwick's proposal—what do you think of that?—It would be practically useless to Collingwood. It would just run through Deriving ward. It is a good gathering ground there as far as it would serve, but it would not be useful to me as a line, and, in opposition to that, you have to cross Victoria-street to see the dense population in the Richmond city, to show how densely populated that part of the Young ward is.

1583. Suppose only one line were to be constructed, and that the Fitzroy line. In that case would you prefer to have that particular route made, joining in with Collingwood station, to having no line?—

I think we would just as soon do without any line. We do not believe in being hitched on like that. It would be very expensive, and would not have the gathering ground that the other would have. There may not be room for two lines at present, but that line would spell it for another line at some future time.

The witness withdrew.

William Cody, sworn and examined.

1586. By the Chairman.—What are you?—Mayor of the city of Collingwood. I am a gentleman, and live at Kew.

1587. Do you know the district of Collingwood?—Yes, I have been a resident of it for about 26 or 27 years, and am almost daily there now.

1588. How long is it since you lived there?—It is about six years since I left Collingwood to reside at Kew.

Northern suburbs.
1890. You are in favour of supplying the northern suburbs with railway communication by a line through Collingwood?—Yes, and I believe justice will never be done until they get a direct line.

1891. Do you think Fitzroy wants a line, because the great portion of their city is within walking distance, and the people would not ride. And another reason is the general belief is that the country people would not go through the tunnel to the city, but would get out and do their shopping in Fitzroy.

1892. Do you know in which part of Fitzroy and Collingwood they do it now?—Yes; in meat and groceries and so on in Johnston-street. More and Cathe's is one of the largest businesses in the suburbs, on the corner of Johnston-street; also T.K. Bennett's: their meat business is also very near the corner of Johnston-street. In fact, there are a great number of businesses spring up within the last year or two in Johnston-street.

1893. Are there many business places in Smith-street?—Yes, a very large one, Mark Foy's; and then there are Tweed-way's and several others.

1894. Which line would suit the country people to get to Foy and Gibson's?—The Collingwood line, I think, would suit them far better, because from the Johnston-street station the train runs past the door of Foy and Gibson's.

1895. Would you ask the country people to come by train to Johnston-street station, where it is at present, and take the train up to the corner of Smith-street, and go in a tram to go to Foy and Gibson's?—No, I would not ask them to do that; the people do that themselves.

1896. How would they come from Collingwood station?—Either by train or tram. If you look at Foy and Gibson's sometimes you see twenty or thirty wagons taking on goods.

1897. Do you know what the complaint is now by people in the north?—That they cannot get a direct way of getting to the city of Melbourne.

1898. I asked where they did their business, and you said in Johnston-street?—I said there was a great number at Johnston-street. They do not look on it so much for the business in those streets, but the facilities for people getting back and forwards to their work; that is, mechanics and work-people and so on.

1899. I presume you know nothing about the country beyond that; you only know about the claims of people in and about the city of Collingwood?—I know a good deal about the people on Hassell Street. They always complain about not getting a direct railway.

1900. A direct line would not be to let them down half-a-mile or three-quarters of a mile from where they are going to do business?—But they do not all go to Foy and Gibson's. If you put a shop, if it is well managed you will always find people to go there. The Collingwood people do not expect we can get a railway to every man's door.

1901. You heard the question put to Mr. Grattan about the feeling ground. How far was it very near to you to Hoddle-street?—All east of Smith-street, leaving Smith-street for the Fitzroy line. If constructed, I think they would all go to the Collingwood line, but, in the event of the two not being constructed, then the work-people would go from Smith-street. The great difficulty is, are there going to be two lines? If the two are going to be constructed, we give the Firrery line all the people in Smith-street and we claim all the rest, but, in the event of only one being constructed, we claim all from Smith-street.

1902. Do you go by train to the city now?—Yes.

1903. How long does it take you?—About three-quarters of an hour to an hour to get from the railway to town. I travel a good deal from here. I travel from town to Collingwood, as business requires me as mayor, and then on to town. I come by the Victorian bridge horse car and then the Victoria-stram train.

1904. Say from morning about the corner of Hoddle-street and Johnston-street, how long does it take by train to reach the Post Office?—About 25 minutes, I think.

1905. How long would you expect them to take by train?—I suppose about fifteen minutes by the train, a difference of 9 minutes.

1906. Do you value that time very much?—Yes, as a business man. The cheap fare on the railway by monthly tickets will induce people to come home to luncheon, and if they had business at night they would come home to tea, or go in to the theatre and amusements of different kinds. A man living in the country and travelling by train can travel five or six times for what he can travel once by the tram. That is the great injustice to the northern suburbs. The working people cannot afford it, and some go in by tram in the morning and walk home at night.

1907. Have they monthly tickets on the trains?—No; we get nothing from them, merely a dozen tickets for 25, 50.

1908. By the Hon. D. McQuilin. —They do not give a return ticket?—No.

1909. Have you seen the proposed time-table of the proposed track to Collingwood?—No; I have read very little about it.

1910. You stated that it would take fifteen minutes; Mr. Fitzpatrick says nine minutes?—That shows a greater advantage than I thought.

1911. Supposing that this takes place—the nine minutes to the city—who will get the traffic; will it be the railway or the tram?—The railway, from all the regular passengers, when they get the monthly and quarterly tickets, because I think everybody knows that Collingwood is the business of the working man and mechanic, and their business is down on the south bank of the Yarra and at North Melbourne, where there are factories and other large business places. They will have a monthly ticket, and go direct by train.

1912. What about the section that will take us to the trains falling into our hands?—Mr. Pratt said at the City Council, that there was no danger.

1913. What would be the meaning of this happening?—As far as we are concerned in Collingwood we would be delighted if they came up tomorrow, and we would take them.

1914. Have both trains and trams?—Yes.

1915. Do you believe in both lines or only one?—If I have no objection to give a railway to everybody, I did not come here to oppose any one.

1916. Do you think the two will ultimately be wanted?—I do think the two will be wanted, because I do not think the Collingwood line will be able to carry all the traffic after a few years.
You are quite sure the State will not suffer us as far as Collingwood is concerned?—I am prepared to say, on behalf of the Collingwood Council and the borough, that Collingwood will bear its proportion. We have a large amount of land that belongs to the ratepayers, and it was discussed whether the ratepayers should give that land, and it was not decided not to give it, but to give it to the Railway Department of their own valuation, and let them build it without any guarantee that we will do our portion. We offered to make a line for it, and we believe the people would do it now. The people of Collingwood have always been expecting to get a line, and they expected every time the line came up they would get it.

You will never be content until you do get it.—No. We thought every Standing Committee saw its duty to give it. I might point out that, in our case, it is the only case that has occurred where Parliament has passed a line through both Houses of Parliament and then not constructed it.

By the Chairman.—You would not accept that line that you spoke of now?—No. Again, if the Collingwood line is constructed, I do not need to call the attention of the Committee to the great advantage it would be in opening up the trade of the Outer Circle. There would be a great traffic on that if the line went on to Prince's Bridge, but when the people were put down in Collingwood only a few travelled.

By the Hon. Dr. Metcalfe.—Do you know that the Upper Chamber made a proposition to give that railway just where you want it now?—Mr. Borthman says the Upper Chamber made an amendment for the line that you now want?—I wish we had some more sensible people in both Houses at that particular time, and we would not be losing our time now. Another thing I would say on behalf of Collingwood, to show whether we mean it or not, is that, if the Standing Committee or the Government will do it, we are quite agreeable to take a vote in both cities, and see whether the people of the two cities want a railway there. I do not believe the people of Fitzroy want a railway; you only took the evidence of a few of them. We did not think we required to do more than come and say we want a line, because we know you had all the facts and figures before you, supplied by the Railway Department, who ought to be in a better position to give facts than any one outside. I can assure you there were 40 or 50 who would be willing to come and give evidence, but we did not want them. I am quite willing that a vote should be taken as to whether the people of Collingwood want the line or not.

That is provided for under the Act, so that your proposal may have to come about by the more force of law?—We would be very pleased at that; then the people could not blame their representatives, either in the House or in the council.

By Mr. J. S. White.—Who represents that portion south of Johnston-street, and east and south-east down as far as Wellington-street?—Is it only portion of a ward? Is it south of Johnston-street too?

Yes?—That would be Councillors Kimberley, Keene, and Galbraith. South of that would be Councillors Bercley, Wilkins, and Jackson.

Are you anxious as to the line?—Yes, because they appointed myself and the others to come and give evidence here, and gave us full power to act.

The people about there have never complained that they would sooner go to the Fitzroy line?—Not to my knowledge.

The witness withdrew.

William James Brewer, sworn and examined.

By the Chairman.—What are you?—Tinplate merchant.

Where is your place of business?—Clifton Hill, near the station.

How long have you been there?—About fourteen years.

That is not Collingwood?—That is in Collingwood, in Loth ward. I have a statement here which I would like to read:—[reading as follows:—]

Principles of Construction.—The principle of railway construction, as followed in Victoria, seems to me of two kinds, viz., to run lines through the country to develop it, so that the people can settle on the land, and have reasonable access to the markets; and to follow the people where they have already settled, or show a disposition to go, in order to carry their produce to capital or railhead.

We have both these principles embodied in the Collingwood line as the northern suburbs.

Population.—The population of Collingwood numbers Heidelberg 4,306, Northcote 6,750, Preston 3,060, Wattleton 1,690, ... 31,000

Making a total of ... 46,900

Add this, say, from North Fitzroy 3,000, Richmond 16,000, East Melbourne and Keel 3,000, ... 46,900

We have 44,900 persons to work on a travelling public.

Mileage Survey.—By the direct line we would save about six miles per train; this on the average present service of nine trains per day, including Sundays, would be 108 miles per day, or 32,420 miles per annum; this above, 2s. 6d. per mile, means a saving of £1,927 per annum on the present train service.

Time saved.—The time saved by the new route from Heidelberg, reckoning six days per week, would be six and a half weeks per annum.

Alternatives to be filled up. On the curved line the Collingwood line to Heidelberg there is a very large area of land already subdivided, and owned by a large number of different persons. They would, in the event of a good train service, build and reside on the various lots, and become regular subscribers to the railway.

Country town east.—The railway to Heidelberg is only the commencement of a valuable line, as the country for about 30 miles farther out is very rich and productive; for fruit and fine culture, thriving, &c., it is being eagerly sought after and settled in small areas. The gold-fields of Bannockburn, Queenstown, and the valley of the Diamond Creek are now carrying a considerable population, and they will, with reasonable facilities, become large subscribers, both as passengers and producers.

Municipal Vote of Land.—The present time is a favorable one to acquire the land through which the Collingwood line will run, as the municipal value of the whole of that land, exclusive of that held by the council, is only £43,000 in Collingwood.

Increase of Population.—Notwithstanding the bad season, or any service at all, the population along and beyond this line is rapidly increasing, and will use the line, as they belong mostly to the manufacturing classes, and that have not the means of running their own conveyances.

Manufactures.—There are a number of important manufactories already established in Collingwood, some of them second to none in the country, using a lot of raw material. The saving to Department on my own business would be about £283 per annum. I estimate five trucks per week would travel the new route, saving in mileage: 6 x 30 x 62 = £1,590, at 2s. 6d. per mile = £195.
Yarra Bend Reserve.—Surveyor General, Northern Suburbs.—The subdivision of the Yarra Bend reserve has been almost an accomplished fact. What value would they be with the present survey? To me it seems that the Government must have a special property in the northern suburbs, but owing to bad management, adverse influence, &c., are making less profit of a profit on it.

Reasons for Constructing a Line.—There is about £30,000 already invested. Why not put some more capital in and make a whole arm a profit? We have from 10,000 to 20,000 people to work on, a very productive country beyond, any amount of space and building materials ready for occupation. We have one-third more population per mile for the 2 miles of Coburg road than the southern suburbs.

District Prophecy.—Early railway of Traffic.—This district is, and has always been, popular. You can see that by the holiday returns for Heidelberg. What the trains have done for Cranbourne will do for Heidelberg, Eltham, &c. Take into consideration the interchanged traffic of the more wealthy, cricket, football matches, &c., this to the saving of revenue by the present route, and we should see daylight in the scheme.

District Notes.—Because might be made by constructing the line on brick arches inavdequate situations. They would readily let for manufactories, stores, shops, &c., and would do away with level crossings.

We have had an example of a level crossing being replaced by a bridge in Swan-street, Richmond, but I think the first cost would be the best. We have heard a good deal about the trains, and we believe that the trains have been largely instrumental in preventing the connection with the city, that is the influence of the trains, and we find now that the company, when they think there is a danger of a connection, trot out the municipalities. I have only to point out the mileage and the great population, and I think we have a good case.

1629. Do you trade largely in timber?—Yes.

1630. What is the value of your output in the year?—About £18,000 to £20,000.

1631. Where do you get the timber from?—The principal part of hard woods comes from Gippsland.

1632. How is it converted to you?—By railway track, ril Spencer-street to Clifton Hill.

1633. Where do you send your stuff principally?—In various directions, to Gippsland and the north-east.

1634. That is soft wood, I suppose?—Yes.

1635. Do you deal in firewood?—Yes, I do not touch firewood.

1636. What opportunities have you of judging of the traffic that there would be from the back country by Heidelberg and the places you have mentioned?—I know the country well. I lived in Heidelberg some sixteen years, and I know the country pretty well up to the country beyond that. Country considered almost valueless some years ago is now found to be very valuable for fruit and vine growing, though it carries very little grass.

1637. Have you any reason to suppose that people would put their fruit on a track and bring it to town, or would they continue the present system of bringing it in, if they had a railway?—I think if the railway were to enter for the business, and put on a train to suit, it would give a large number of people in the outlying districts a chance of getting their milk and so on into Melbourne. They want a direct line that will prevent them coming into the city. Saving in toll will allow perishable goods from a much greater distance to be brought to the city.

1638. In your own case, how much do you pay the Railways per annum?—I suppose about £60 a year, that is the incoming timber, the outgoing timber is paid for by the people at the other end.

1639. Supposing there were a direct line to Flinders-street would you get your timber that way or still by Spencer-street?—I should say, if the Department were wise, by Flinders-street, because it would be a great saving to themselves. If I had only one track the train would have to travel with that track.

1640. How do you travel now?—I drive with a horse and buggy. Although I have lived in the northern suburbs since the present line was constructed, I can safely say I have never travelled all the way to the city by train.

1641. Would you travel by the proposed line if it were made?—Yes, I would take a monthly ticket at once.

1642. And save horse- flesh?—I have two horses now, and then I could sell one.

1643. By the Hon. D. McNeile.—If the line were made, as proposed, to Coburgwood, and if nine minutes to Coburgwood were the time occupied by the train, which would get the traffic, the trains or the tram?—The trains would get it certainly.

1644. From all round your neighbourhood?—Yes.

1645. What about killing the trains?—I think it would have no injurious effect on the trains?—In my opinion the population would exceed so much that I do not think the trains would suffer at all. There would still be a number of people how would jump in them.

1646. What do you think of the opposition to these lines on the part of the train?—I think it is tested out by the interested shareholders. I think there is nothing in it.

The witness withdraws.

Thomas Latham, sworn and examined.

1647. By the Chairman.—What are you?—Secretary. Live at Ivanhoe.

1648. Do you want a better railway communication than you have at present with the city?—Yes. I have lived at Ivanhoe for over six years, and am a daily traveler on the railway line. For the last year or two I have been a periodic ticket holder from Ivanhoe to Melbourne, and traveled on the long journey. I get the value of my money in distance, but I do not get the value of my time. If I get into the train at Ivanhoe at six minutes to eight in the morning I get to Flinders-street at five minutes to nine, an hour and a minute. Going home I leave Flinders-street at five minutes past five, and get out of the train at five minutes past six, and the distance is really only 6 miles by road, as came out in the evidence of other witnesses. I touch at fifteen stations in that journey.

1649. The railway was made to Heidelberg before you went to live at Ivanhoe?—Yes. I would not have gone to live there unless it was thought to be more convenient, but I thought we would get a through connection. I built a house at Ivanhoe thinking we would get a through service.

1650. Would you have bought land at Ivanhoe and built a house if you had thought there would be no connection?—No, I would not. There are five members of my family who are coming in daily.

1651. Are they going round by Spencer-street?—Some of them do.
Are the people generally dissatisfied, as you are?—Yes, generally. They feel we have been left waiting for what we should have had years ago.

Do many people come by the road now instead of coming half-way?—Yes. One gentleman, within the last month, has got so tired of it that he has got a horse and buggy and now travels by road.

Which of the two lines do the people about you prefer?—The Collingwood line is generally considered the better of the two.

What is the difference in the distance?—Nothing worth speaking about.

Why do you prefer the Collingwood line?—Because of the long tunnel on the Fitzroy line; it is a very serious obstacle.

What harm is there in a tunnel?—It is because of its smokiness and unhealthiness. I have travelled through all the tunnels we have, and they are by no means desirable. We would rather travel on the surface, and if we have a tunnel we want as little of it as possible.

Have you any other reasons why you should go to the expense of constructing a northern suburban line?—I think the cheaper lines and saving of time would induce a much larger traffic than we have on the line at the present time. The saving of time is really a very serious matter. It takes me in the train nearly two hours a day. Our district is a beautiful district, but inaccessible compared with other suburbs. If we had a direct service I believe the population of our district would very largely increase; in fact, since the cheap fares have been changed between Melbourne and Fairfield, nearly all the houses at Fairfield that were empty are occupied.

Have you any idea where the population came from?—No, I do not know where they came from.

Do you think that two lines of railway would pay there?—I do not know; I am not an expert in that, but if they are going to be constructed I do not think you will ever have a cheaper one for doing it. We know that labour is cheap, and I know from my own experience that property is cheap.

We hear that property is rising in value?—It has not come my way.

The witness withdrew.

WEDNESDAY, 31ST OCTOBER, 1896.

Members present:

Mr. Cameron, in the Chair;
The Hon. D. McIvor, M.L.C.,
The Hon. E. Mawby, M.L.C.,
Mr. Barton,
Mr. Craven,
Mr. Harris,
Mr. J. S. White.

Sir Arthur Snowden, sworn and examined.

1852. 

By the Chairman.—You are a councillor of the city of Melbourne?—Yes, and a very old resident of Collingwood.

1853. 

We understand that the City Council wishes to give evidence in opposition to the construction of the proposed lines to the northern suburbs!—The City Council is a body, and the members of the City Council generally, are opposed to the continuation of the Fitzroy and Collingwood lines into the city as being adverse to the interests of the Tramways Trust. The Tramways Trust is a vested interest, the reversion of which at a comparatively short period will become the property and be vested in the city of Melbourne and the surrounding municipalities, free from any obligations to the existing Tramways Company. At present, of course, the city of Melbourne is not interested in any shares in the Tramways Company, but it has a clear and distinct vested interest in the whole tramway works immediately on the expiry of the existing lease to the Tramways Company, which I think will be in about twenty years' time—that is their main objection. I may go so far as to say that the tramways are so perfect and convenient, and run at such frequent intervals, and penetrate the city in so many directions, that the accommodation, not only to the citizens and suburban residents themselves, but also to all others arriving by rail from all parts, is a wonderful convenience, and is a vested interest which the city councillors think should not be interfered with.

1854. 

The interest of the council does not exist until the twenty years have expired?—That is so, but that is the main ground on which the City Council opposes the continuation of the Fitzroy or Collingwood lines into the city.

1855. 

By Mr. Barton.—Are there any other grounds that you wish to urge?—No other grounds on behalf of the city.

1856. 

By the Chairman.—Are the municipalities likely to take possession of the tramways and manage them as a Trust, or to re-let them?—I presume they would re-let them, but that is a question for the future.

1857. 

Because it would interfere with the interests of the Trust the people on the north side of the city should never have any railway accommodation at all?—They have accommodation now to Spencer-street in one direction and to Johnston-street in another—from Johnston-street they can travel to any part of the city in a very few minutes.

1858. 

In how many minutes?—I timed myself yesterday morning; from the Johnston-street station to the corner of Queen and Bourke-streets occupied nineteen minutes—that was a fair average time, and I passed through the centre of the city.

1859. 

You got a transfer on the tram?—Yes, I can transfer at three places. This morning I timed myself from door to door—fifteen minutes, from St. Helens-street, Abbotsford, at the extreme end of Collingwood, to my own office occupied twenty-four minutes, that includes walking to the tramway and walking from the tramway to the office.

1860. 

But do not the people from the north often have to wait at Johnston-street five minutes for the tram to come?—If I never saw them wait for five minutes—as the trams run every four or five minutes you cannot have to wait very long. From the terminus at Johnston-street to Prince's-bridge the time is 29½ minutes, and that line passes through the centre of the city in its entire length from north to south.

1861. 

You think there is sufficient accommodation for the people beyond to come in by tram?—I think it is splendid accommodation.
1072. Do you think it is sufficient—do you see them bring their goods off the train at Johnson-street and put them or the trains?—A few hundreds, they do, but when they get to Flinders street in the train they would be subject to the same inconvenience did it not get to Flinders-street there.

1073. Are the railways made for passengers and not for goods?—If they have goods they can go to Spencer-street.

1074. Supposing the people beyond are dealing with Fitzroy and Collingwood what are they to do with their goods?—I suppose pretty much the same as they would do from the railway station; they would have to get along the best way they could.

1075. You think the same accommodation should not be given to the people living in the north of the city as those on the south?—That is a matter of opinion. If the northern suburbs railways could pervert the centre of the city in the same way as the tramways do, and they did not cost too much money, and were likely to pay, they would be an advantage, and if the majority of the people coming in from Heidelberg wanted to go to places within a radius of 100 yards from the station at Flinders-street, it would be good for them, but when they get to Flinders-street they are nearly as far from the centre of the city as when they are at Johnson-street.

1076. Which is the centre of the city?—Say from Bourke-street right up to Victoria-street.

1077. Taking the Post Office to be about the centre, as it is in half-way between Flinders-street and Victoria-street, and half-way between Spring-street and Spencer-street, do you say that it is an easy to go from Johnson-street railway station to the Post Office as from Flinders-street?—I should say it was easier. If the railway line you into Flinders-street, which would not be done under a quarter of an hour from Johnson-street, then you have to walk from the station to the Post Office, which I suppose would take another ten minutes or quarter of an hour. On the other hand, it would be done in the same time, or perhaps a little less, and you would be able to ride the whole distance.

1078. How would the goods that are produced to the north of Fitzroy and Collingwood come into the centre of the city?—As far as goods are concerned, in respect of which there need be no great issue, they would be as well off at Spencer-street as at Flinders-street. In reference to passing through the centre of the city my evidence refers more particularly to passenger accommodation.

1079. Your evidence refers more to the people who are between Johnson-street and the city than to those beyond Johnson-street?—No, I refer to every one, I do not care who it is, coming in by the northern lines.

1080. Do you mean to say that you could say to the people of St. Kilda that it is quite as convenient for them to leave the train at South Melbourne and get into town the way they can—by train or anything else?—I say that by walking down Little Collins-street and catching the St. Kilda train at the junction of Little Collins-street and Swanston-street I can get to the greater part of St. Kilda as quickly as by walking to the Flinders-street railway station, going by train to St. Kilda, and walking from the station there to my destination.

1081. You contend that there is no use for railway accommodation in the north any more than there is in the west?—So far as I can see, the accommodation at present is ample and convenient for the majority of the citizens.

1082. You do admit that it would be more convenient if you could bring a line from the northern districts into an central position as the trains are now?—I say if the line came through the heart of Melbourne and the trains were run at as frequent intervals as the trains are run now, it would be as accommodation as convenient as the trains themselves.

1083. If the railway station were near the General Post Office you would think it would be a convenience?—Yes, there is no doubt of that—that goes without saying.

1084. If there were a line from the Collingwood station along Hoddle-street to Victoria-street up to Victoria-street to the Male Schools and down Lonsdale-street to Elizabeth-street with a high level station in Lonsdale-street, how would that suit?—It might suit a few.

1085. That would come very near the centre of the city?—Yes, but then people would have to take themselves to go by train; as it is now, they need not take themselves—they go by trains running at frequent intervals with a splendid system of transfer, to go north, east, or west, and they stop anywhere—they are not confined to a particular station.

1086. Supposing the farmers beyond want to bring is produce you admit they cannot bring it on the trains?—If they want to bring in heavy stuff they must take a few extra minutes and go round by Spencer-street. If people are travelling with luggage it is no great amount of inconvenience to them to go round.

1087. Do you know the population to the north in the valley of the Yarra, the Diamond Creek, and the Plenty, as far up as Woodstock?—No.

1088. You cannot possibly be a judge as to their requirements in the way of facilities for getting into the city?—In any respect of the case they can either take the quicker and more convenient route from Johnson-street by the tram, or if they have heavy luggage they can travel the extra 3 miles to Spencer-street, which would not take very long. If they could be a passenger to those people to have to travel that extra 3 or 4 miles, and to pay for that extra distance, when it is reasonable to suppose the line ought to come direct?—It would take a little more time and cost a little more money—I do not know that it would be much punishment to people coming on a long journey.

1089. Why do you not travel on foot instead of coming in by train?—When I was younger I very often did so. The present tramway accommodation is so splendid, so cheap, and so convenient that it seems to me to meet all requirements.

1090. Who more in the matter of the opposition to these lines?—I forgot how the matter came before the City Council.

1091. It did not emanate from the City Council itself?—I am under the impression it arose from some conference of the municipalities in connection with the Tramways Trust.

1092. Are the railways in the southern suburbs in existence when the tramways were commenced there?—To the best of recollection they were.

1093. Is the population of the southern suburbs more or less than it was when the tram started?—So many new districts have sprung up that I would say that since the railways have been extended the population of the southern suburbs has increased.
1695. The company did not hesitate to build those tram lines, notwithstanding the existence of the railways?—I presume not.

1696. Do you think the country would have allowed the company to build the northern tram lines if it had been thought that that would be bar to the construction of railways there?—I cannot say—it is very hard to give an opinion on that.

1697. Do you think the Legislature would have allowed the company to build those tram lines if the condition had been made that they should never have a railway in the northern suburbs?—That is a matter of speculation and opinion—they have their railway from Spencer-street already. I am not opposed to a railway coming into Melbourne from the northern suburbs if it can be brought into Melbourne so as to pass through the centre of the city, and accommodate the whole of the inhabitants of the city with the same facility, cheapness, and expedition as the tramways do now—in that case it would be an advantage.

1698. Would it matter whether it was a tunnel or an open cutting?—That is a question for engineers. In London the railways are built right into the centre of the city—otherwise the terminal of the various railways would be far more distant from the centre of the city than Johnston-street is.

1699. By the Hon. D. Melville.—You main argument against the construction of these lines is that you are interested in the reversion of the tramways twenty years hence, and you want to maintain the value of the cable?—The vested right of the municipalities in regard to the Tramways Trust.

1700. You have been speaking of Melbourne proper—you have not looked at Greater Melbourne?—I am speaking at the immediate suburbs.

1701. But this morning you only represent Melbourne proper?—That is the object of my visit here—I have also given my own opinion as an individual and a resident of Collingwood in answer to questions put to me.

1702. If these lines are built, what will be the effect upon this property that is to come into your hands twenty years hence?—I think the best illustration is the effect of the railway upon Brunswick. Judging from that there will be a loss to both railways and tramways. On the Brunswick line they run the 4½ miles for 26s in opposition to the railways.

1703. Can you prove that the State is losing on that line?—No.

1704. Or that the trains are losing?—No. All I know is that the trains are paying very small dividends, and for shorter journeys on the lines where there is no opposition the fare is 6d.

1705. Has the result since the fares have been lowered?—I cannot say; I do not think the fares have been doubled?—I suppose cheap fares induce frequent traffic, but it produces a corresponding amount of expense.

1706. Would you be surprised to hear that they are getting three times the money on the tram, and the returns of the railway have been doubled?—I suppose cheap fares induce frequent traffic, but it produces a corresponding amount of expense.

1707. If you are satisfied that this opposition has affected the reverse of what you suppose, is not your opposition withdrawn?—I do not say it is withdrawn—that is a problem to be worked out.

1708. You admit that railways and tramways have a developing influence?—Yes.

1709. I find it not conceivable that twenty years hence our population may not be ten times what it is now?—I should think not; if it increases 15 per cent., or 20 per cent., it is as much as it will.

1710. This is what Mr. Fitzpatrick says—"What will be the quickest time in which a passenger going from Prince's-bridge will reach Fitzroy through the tunnel and on to the first station?—From Clifton Hill to Prince's-bridge twelve minutes on the Collingwood line; from Collingwood to Prince's-bridge nine minutes at Prince's-bridge, east side, to the first station on the Fitzroy line going to Fitzroy?—Gray-street is 55 chains, and it would take two minutes. The next station—Gertrude-street—1 mile 10 chains, four minutes; Johnston-street, 1 mile 50 chains, six minutes. Will any competition that they can set up in the trains affect that?—That is how we want to get the traffic. Fitzroy, 2 miles 10 chains, eight minutes, are you able to maintain that safely?—Certainly." Is it not desirable to bring all those people within six minutes of Prince's-bridge?—Judging from the expedition used on other suburban lines I do not think they would do it.

1711. Mr. Fitzpatrick says they can—would you put your perpetual bar against those people attaining that desirable end?—I have no wish to do so.

1712. Do you want to condemn these people for all time to go round by Royal Park and Flemington-bridge?—It all depends upon where they want to go when they get to Melbourne. If they want to get to Flinders street no doubt the line on the east would be the nearest.

1713. But do you wish to condemn the people in those rising municipalities with populations larger than your own to make that extra journey?—I do not want to condemn them to anything—I do not think they would be condemned; they have already accommodation to come in to Melbourne. For hansom and heavy traffic Spencer-street is as good as Flinders-street; and with regard to passenger traffic, the accommodation at Johnston-street now in connection with the tram is a wonderful convenience. With a railway people have to time themselves, and they have to walk to the station, whereas with the tram they have not to time themselves, and they have no distance to walk to the tram, and they can get on and off at any point.

1714. Suppose you lived at Port Melbourne, and it was proposed to bring you round by St. Kilda and Pakan on your way to town, would that be convenient to you?—I should prefer the straight journey undoubtedly.

1715. Would you put up with it—would you not be an active agitator to get a direct line?—Possibly I might.

1716. If these lines were built, and showed a profit, would you withdraw your opposition?—If it paid the State interest on the money expended I should say the State would be justified in doing it—that is considering the State alone, and apart from the vested interest of the Tramways Trust, but my object is to protect on behalf of the City Council against interfering with the vested interests of the Tramways Trust.

1717. In other words you say—Here is a gigantic monopoly, and we want to keep it a monopoly, with no railways?—Yes. You have a railway already.

1718. By Mr. Barton.—Looking at this map you see that a tram line passes up Smith-street to the Heidelberg-road, turning along the Heidelberg-road and on to the Plenty-road?—Yes.
119. Then from the intersection of Johnston and Smith streets a tram runs to the Johnston-street
bridge?—Yes.
1729. Those trams run in the one case to the river, and in the other to the Merri Creek?—Yes.
1730. Looking at the district between those two lines, do you think these trams, like two rivers, divide
for the population in that area of Clifton Hill, and a large portion of Collingwood?—They do not provide
for the Centre of the block.
1722. You said the tramways system was so perfect that it could not be improved upon by any
railway that could be made—do you consider the people in that block are perfectly provided for?—I think
they are reasonably provided for. If the railway ran through that district every one would have to walk
to the station. Then the tramway goes in various directions, whereas the railway only goes in one
direction.
1723. Are there any other tramways except the two I have described that can be run by those people?—No, but that is not a very large district. The Clifton Hill people can get into a tram very
quickly by going to the Heidelberg-road, which runs obliquely through the district.
1724. Now, coming north of Johnston-street, and taking the large block between Johnston and
Victoria streets and Smith-street and the river, are those people perfectly provided with tram accom-
modation?—I think so—every man has not got a tram to his front door—to be perfect the tramway must
run down every street and to every man's door.
1725. You think that section of Collingwood that I have described is fully provided for?—I think
fully and fairly provided for; the tramway system of Collingwood provides for the inhabitants fully and
fairly.
1726. With regard to vested interests, did the Tramways Trust or the Tramways Company take
into consideration the vested interests of the people of this county when they laid the tramways down in
the southern suburbs?—I cannot say.
1727. Did you name any vested interest on behalf of the people against that interference with the
vested right of the people?—No, I was not in the City Council then. When the southern railways were
first started I was one of the shareholders, and lost every farthing of money; that was the old
Hobson's Bay line, which was a private enterprise. The Port Melbourne and St. Kilda lines were also
private enterprises. One portion of the line was therefor abandoned; that was the old loop line from St. Kilda into the Brighton line.
1728. Those railways were constructed a considerable time before the tramways were constructed?
—I believe so.
1729. The City Council, who were interested in the tramways as a trust, made no objection to the
competition of the trains against the railways?—I have no recollection of any objection, but I was not in
the council then.
1730. The vested interest idea has only occurred recently?—Possibly so.
1721. Do the Tramways Company issue monthly tickets at a cheaper rate so as to encourage work-
men and others coming in to town?—They issue 1d. daily tickets to workmen.
1732. Are they available all day long?—Yes.
1733. The holder must travel by a particular tram?—Yes, or he must wait for another 1d. tram.
There are several of them.
1734. How many workmen's trains run on the one line?—There are several I know. He would
not have to walk so long as he would have to wait for another train. The train to those northern suburbs
would not run at more frequent intervals than half-an-hour or an hour, but the trains run at intervals of a
few minutes.
1735. Do you know whether the company issue monthly tickets to workmen?—No, they do not
issue monthly tickets; they make an allowance of 1d. on every dozen tickets; then there are the city
tickets at half-fare.
1736. It has been stated in evidence that the cost of these monthly tickets to workmen, their
wives and children, only amounts to about 1s. for each journey by tram; is there any hope of the Tramways
Trust urging the Tramways Company to act in that way and bring down the fares, or have you taken
any action to bring it about?—No, I think the Tramways Company are very reasonable; they run
the workmen's trains early and late at half-fare, and considering the distance they go and the in-
tervals which they run, I think the fares are low enough to accommodate the poorest people.
1737. If we refuse to build these lines is there any likelihood of the Trust urging the company to
give those people a cheaper means of transit, so as to in some measure approach the fares charged on the
railways?—No, I think not; they can travel for 1d., whilst certain limits in the city now.
1722. There is no hope of the Tramways Trust using its influence with the Tramways Company in
that direction?—I am not aware of their being any movement in that direction yet. There was a move-
ment some time ago about running sectional fares. Whether that could be done or not I cannot say, but
the tramway accommodation is very wonderful and very convenient in every way, and it does not appear
to be a paying concern.
1739. Do you know if the lines to the northern suburbs are a profitable portion of the service?—
I think the northern tramway system is the most profitable.
1740. That is why you object on behalf of the Trust?—I believe you will find the northern lines to
be profitable, because the southern trams go through so many miles of park lands which the northern trams
do not. I notice that in going northwards there are frequent changes of passengers along the whole route.
1741. Do you object now simply as a representative of the city of Melbourne from a local point of
view, or from a national point of view?—I can only repeat that the city of Melbourne, as one of the
municipalities interested, object to the extension of the railways within the municipal areas which would
interfere with the vested interests of the Tramways Trust.
1742. In other words, it is simply a local objection, not a national one?—I think the interests
of the city of Melbourne and the suburban municipalities are so great as to become national.
1743. By the Hon. E. Morley.—Is not it a very selfish position for the city of Melbourne to take up?
—in all modesty with every one looks at it from a selfish point of view?
1744. Is it not the duty of the City Council to try and forward the interests of the people and let
them travel as cheaply as possible, and as quickly as possible?—I think, as a general statement, yes.
1745. Do the Tramways Company give sectional tickets in any of the suburbs? — Yes, from Johnston-street to Northcote bridge is 1d. only.

1746. How long does it take to come from Northcote by tram to the centre of the city? — From Northcote bridge it would take about the same time as to come from Acland Street to Prince’s bridge, or 20 minutes.

1747. Do you not think the saving of half that time would be a great consideration to a man of business? — It would all depend upon how near the station he lived, and how near his business was to the station in Melbourne. If he lived close by the station at North Fitzroy, and had to go into Flinders-street close to the station, of course he would save the time; but if he had a quarter of a mile or more at each end to walk, and had to time himself to get to the North Fitzroy station, and when he got to Melbourne he had a third or half a mile to walk from the station he would save nothing — he would not do it as quickly as by the train.

1748. The trains do not drop everybody at his own door — people have to walk to their places. — Yes, but the tram goes through the heart of Melbourne in several places, and the tram will stop at the corner of every street, or anywhere between the streets, practically they will take you up and set you down anywhere.

1749. Have they not the same privilege at Flinders-street of getting off the train into the tram and going to any part of the city? — Yes; if the railway came through Collingwood, and I came in by train, when I get to the Flinders-street station, to get to my office in Little Collins-street I should either take a Collins-street tram or a Flinders-street tram, whereas coming in from Collingwood by tram it takes me right to the door. I say that people coming in by train can get to their destinations with greater facility, and without great loss of time than in coming in by tram and then being landed at the one spot in Flinders-street, where there is also a considerable distance to travel from the train before they get to the station door. I am not opposed to the line, but you are asking me to the convenience of it as compared with the tramways.

1750. As a citizen do you not think that instead of spending money in altering the course of the Yarra it would be better to make a railway to serve the people beyond Collingwood? — It would go a little way towards it, but that is a Government question.

1751. Why should the people of the northern suburbs be made to travel round that circle in order to reach Melbourne? — It all depends upon where they want to go. If they want to come to Flinders-street it will be further round, but if they want to go to West Melbourne, I do not see that it would be any great disadvantage.

1752. You know that there is a large population in those northern suburbs, and they supply the city with a great deal of produce? — Yes.

1753. Is it not the duty of the Government to provide them with ready access to the city? — I do not think the station at Flinders-street can furnish any better accommodation for goods traffic — goods traffic must go to Spencer-street.


1755. Are you a director of the Tramways Company? — No.

1756. Are there many people travelling by tram between those points? — Yes, a good many. From one end of the tramway system to the other they are perpetually getting on and getting off.

1757. We had evidence yesterday that there was very little picking up between Gertrude-street and town! — There is a good deal. When you turn the corner of Gertrude-street and get into Nicholson-street, people will walk to Brunswick-street to take advantage of 1d. fare; but all the way from Johnston to Gertrude-street there are a great many people getting on and off; and coming from Smith-street to the corner of Nicholson-street, people are getting on and off.

1758. Taking the traffic along Johnston-street from Smith-street to Nicholson-street towards Melbourne, those people would have to go to the station and then be landed in Flinders-street; would many of them go by rail? — I think it is very small proportion.

1759. Then the railway must look on so much traffic from there? — The traffic from any part of Collingwood or Fitzroy would be very small compared with what would come by train. There are four tramways penetrating the large districts of Carlton, Collingwood, and Fitzroy, all within three-quarters of a mile of each other. There are the North Carbon, the Brunswick-street, the Nicholson-street, and the Collingwood lines running north and south in parallel lines almost. The trams run at very frequent intervals, and they take you through the city in all directions; they issue, by which you can travel in any direction, and they run at such frequent intervals that there is no necessity to time yourself, whereas the railway would only be a convenience to those who lived close by the station in the suburbs, and wanted to go to a place close to the station in town. I think for distances under 3 miles the tramway system is better.
1761. The Engineer-in-Chief said he thought people would come from Lygon-street to feed the Young-street line; do you think they would cross three trams to reach that railway?—A small percentage of them might—those who lived near the station and had to go to Flanders-street.

1764. Do you think the percentage would be 1 in 500?—I cannot say; but in Richmond, Collingwood, and Fitzroy the tramway accommodation is so splendid that comparatively very few people would take advantage of the railway.

1766. It is said there would be a large traffic in connexion with the Exhibition Building.—That is only an occasional requirement.

1767. Do you think the large traffic would go there by all in preference to being landed by the tram in Nicholson-street?—If the station in Gertrude-street was convenient to the Exhibition gates they might do so. If the people coming in from the south by rail could get a train going right up to the Exhibition they might take it, but it all depends upon the frequency with which the trams come from the southern suburbs. It must be borne in mind that the trams in connexion with the Exhibition must run at intervals of two or three minutes.

1768. Is there to be a line at all which would you recommend?—If any part wants supplying at all with a railway I think it should be built according to Mr. Milman’s plan, or if you want to supply the outer parts of Collingwood I should simply bring it from Johnston-street, as far east as possible, through Richmond, and join the line at Burley, according to the original scheme. The original scheme is the best and cheapest; it would supply people not now supplied, and it would enable thousands to go into the parks. If you could bring the line to the east so as to tap Studley Park it would be a public benefit, and there would be more local traffic resulting from that than by taking it through parts that are now so well served by the trams. The present proposed routes, in my opinion, are an utter absurdity so far as concerns accommodation for Collingwood and Fitzroy.

1770. The witness withdrew.

John Stedford, sworn and examined.

1770. By the Chairman.—What are you?—A liquidator of the Metropolitan Bank. I reside in St. Kilda. I have been there about fourteen years, and 14 years in Melbourne.

1771. You have written some letters to the papers giving some reasons why the lines to the northern suburbs should not be constructed?—I may say I represent, in the first place, national interests; in the second, the interests of the Tramways Trust. My present interests are all on the other side. The statement made was that the Tramways Company undertook to build those lines themselves without the municipalities undertaking any responsibility. The question is, if they did that why do the municipalities claim a possible responsibility supposing this property is made unpayable. The facts of the case are that they would be saving about £140,000 a year which they are paying now at the present time in the form of rents. Sir Arthur Snowden said that the municipalities had to wait twenty years before they derived any benefit from the Tramways Company; that is not so. The municipalities are deriving at the present time a benefit to the extent of, probably, £50,000 every year. The direct benefits they receive are rates to the amount of about £2,000 a year, that is a direct cash payment to them. Beyond that, in the last balance-sheet of the Tramways Company the expenditure on the roads for maintenance was close on £40,000, and this maintenance is equal to a direct payment to the municipalities, inasmuch as it saves them the outlay of that or possibly a smaller amount. I have been informed by members of the City Council that on one section of the line on the Sydney-road the difference it made to their expenditure was about £4,000 a year.

1777. That was calculated on the traffic of bricks and stone on that road four or five years ago, whereas there has been nothing of that sort lately?—No. The tramway for the bricks and stone was down long before the Tramways Company was there at all. I come now to the main facts of my opponent to the lines themselves which I think are of very serious importance. As far as I can gather from the evidence given and the claims made on the part of both Fitzroy and Collingwood, the claim is not made on the ground that they have not sufficient facilities for travel already. It is set made on the ground that the tramwray Company are not able to cope with the traffic that offers, and to bring it conveniently and quickly to the city. The claim is made on the ground, as far as I can gather, of cost. Mr. Gahan made a great point of the fact that a periodical ticket would be obtained for 5s. a month; others say:—And we should do so for 1d. or 1¼. Looking at it from a cursory point of view, if you can decrease the cost of travel it necessarily follows that it would be an advantage to the public at large, but there is no force in that contention whatever. You may not know it, but there is no claim to build a railway for the purpose of making 2½d. a trip more cheaply than 5d. Next year you will be receiving the highest fares to ½d. if they like, if it can be shown on behalf of the tramways and the municipalities that that is a fair charge to make. So where does the contention arise that it is necessary to construct a railway to bring in people cheaply when the present service is efficient and sufficient, and a reasonable conclusion can be arrived at by Parliament as to the value of the services rendered. I claim that all the arguments used on behalf of Collingwood and Fitzroy for the construction of those lines have no force whatever, when Parliament has the right to fix the fares at anything they consider reasonable.

1778. Would the shareholders of the tram company submit to that?—They have to submit. Parliament is the directing power and Parliament can compel them to submit; they have no power to refuse.

1779. Parliament very seldom inflicts penalties of that kind?—Then you are arguing in my favour, as Parliament would not do injustice by reducing fares below a paying rate.

1780. Have they not as much power to protest against as they have to protest against their neighbours getting the convenience of a railway?—As individuals they have, but when you come to a number of people who are not malefactors against whom you are, a large number to contend with, it is the interest it is to travel at the cheapest possible rate at the expense of any private company. The Premier, at a valedictory dinner to Lord Hopetoun, took great credit to himself for creating a new class of critics. He was referring to the Income Tax, and he said the payers of the Income Tax would look sharply after how the money was spent in the future though it had been wasted in the past, and I hold that the Income Tax payers, have a right to investigate the question as to the reduction of fares to increase traffic, and the Brunswick line has been illustrated over and over again. The Brunswick fares at present to Mitcham or Coburg are something like 3d. second class return. I do not know of my own knowledge whether it pays to take people by rail at those fares, but I do know a reduction from 3d. to 2d. in the tramway fares has made what was a payable line into an unpayable line, as I was informed by the secretary of the company.
1775. By the Hon. D. Molleville.—Can you swear that is so?—I swear I was told so. I was told so by the secretary of the company at an interview he had with the Finance Committee when the subject was discussed. He made that statement; I have not in writing.

1776. By the Chairman.—What does that prove?—That to have the fares chargeable by the Railway Department for those lines on the rates already obtaining for similar distances will make them unpayable also.

1777. That argues that no reduction should be made against a private company?—As long as it involved a loss, that is my opinion. Then again, there is a great deal of talk about the traffic of the trains and the large number of people who travel, but there is one phase of the question I would like to mention, viz., that a great number of people who travel by trains are pleasure seekers. There are thousands of people travelling by train for pleasure who would not take the rail or train otherwise. This pleasure traffic is created by the trains, and would not be created by the Railway Department. There is another phase of the question as to this railway. As far as I am aware, it goes through tunnels. I do not know if you have travelled in the underground railway in London; I have, and I would rather pay 6d. for a ride in a tram than pay 3d., or nothing, for a ride through a tunnel, more especially in a climate like this. There is another phase of the question that may not have suggested itself to your minds. I believe it would not be a bad thing for the company if both these lines were constructed, because, by the fact of constructing those lines you parallelize parliamentary action in future; the distinction of interfering with the ferries. Parliament is not going to let down tramcar fares on lines that come in competition with State lines, so from the company's point of view, I question if it would not be better to have those lines constructed. Then again, reference has been made to St. Kilda, and the inconvenience we have there of railways and tram services, but the area of St. Kilda is now more equal to the area of Fitzroy and Collingwood. It is a larger area. The population, no doubt, is more dense in Collingwood and Fitzroy, but the claim of the northern suburbs is as to the area to be served. If we come to the northern suburbs themselves, from my point of view there is no chance of an increase of population to any extent in that direction for many years to come. We know there the population is being decreased, and if there is an increase of population waiting in place in the metropolitan district, there are already something like 20,000 houses in the various suburbs vacant, taking the whole of Greater Melbourne.

1778. By the Hon. D. Molleville.—Those empty houses are mostly in the south—[I am interested in about 200 houses in Collingwood and East Richmond, and if you exist the nominal rents of 1s. a week, and do not reckon those as occupied, there will be fully 20,000 unoccupied houses in Greater Melbourne at the present time, which I hold would house about 100,000 people, taking an average of five to a house. I include the 1s. a week men in the 20,000 unoccupied houses. In our own case we have 100 to 150 properties out of 600 which are let at those rents.

1779. Of the 20,000 are half occupied at 1s. a week?—No, I take that from the current literature of the day which compiled that number a few months ago. The only estimate I can give is that we own 600 properties and 20 per cent. are occupied at nominal rents or empty, I would assume that would be a basis for the rest.

1780. Do I understand that 4,000 are occupied at nominal rents?—Yes, or empty.

1781. Then there are 16,000 unoccupied?—Yes, in Greater Melbourne.

1782. You do not know how many of those empty houses are in Fitzroy and Collingwood?—No; I can only speak for my own institution. I say that I consider the northern suburbs are fully justified in their agitation for a railway, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

My protest at the present moment is on the ground that the lines cannot be made to pay from the population residing within the area, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.

1783. You do not know how many of those empty houses are in Fitzroy and Collingwood?—No; I can only speak for my own institution. I say that I consider the northern suburbs are fully justified in their agitation for a railway, and they should have had a railway years ago. It has been a grave mistake that some of the payable lines in the country districts were not constructed there.
no lower, and any further loss means a loss from their 4½ per cent. Out of that 4½ per cent, they have to pay a fixed charge, amounting to something like £110,000 a year. In 1860, when the first section of the tramways was opened, there was about one-half opened, and they paid a dividend of 72 per cent, on £2,875,000. That was the reason that the tram shares were to such enormous take-up. It was assumed that the latter portion of the lines would certainly hold their own or increase, but the next year after the collapse of the banks they did not pay any dividend until the end of the year. They would not pay any dividend on account until the accounts were balanced at the end of the year, and they found then they could pay 5 per cent, and they did so; but the 5 per cent dividend does not represent a fair income to the shareholders, because I do not suppose there was one in twenty who got his shares at 10s. The chances are that the average payment made by the shareholders has been nearer 50s., so in a great many instances they only received 1 per cent.

1783. How many bonzes did they pay?—The bonus was included in the 72 per cent.

1784. How many 72 per cent. dividends did they pay?—Oh, they paid 32 per cent. next year, when the balance of the lines were nearly completed. As soon as they were constructed they dropped to 5 per cent, and they have continued at that ever since.

1785. Did the 72 per cent. come out of the earnings?—Yes.

1786. Where did the £100,000 that they have put in the liquidating account come from?—That is the sinking fund that is established every year for the redemption of the trams in the end.

1787. Where does that come from?—That has come from the revenue; the company does not get that.

1788. If they have paid £40,000 of the capital off, and have been paying 72 per cent, and 50 per cent. dividends, surely they must have paid well?—That £40,000 is the sinking fund for eleven years.

1789. By the Chairman.—After paying into the sinking fund £300,000 odd every year they paid to the shareholders 5 ½ per cent.?—Yes.

1790. On £1,650,000?—No, on £400,000, and 41 per cent. on £1,250,000. The capital belonging to the Tramways Trust is £1,650,000; the capital belonging to the company is £480,000, which is invested in the concern.

1791. If the £300,750 is paid out of the earnings, it shows a tremendous profit on the £2,000,000 to be able to pay 5 per cent, and the sinking fund?—Yes, that is the position.

1792. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Are you one of the lucky men who got this 72 per cent.?—No.

1793. Do you not include Fitzroy and Collingwood in the northern suburbs?—Yes; I refer to the places beyond.

1794. Have you any idea of the population of Northcote?—A fairly good idea. We have properties there and I have been through them.

1795. Beyond Northcote there is the shire of Preston, and the shire of Epping, and the shire of Whittlesea?—Yes. I should be glad to see all those places settled, and the shire of Heidelberg and the shire of Eildon.

1796. Have you any knowledge of the amount in tons that those districts produce and send to Melbourne for sale?—No; but if that is going to be a factor in the construction of this railway, I agree with Sir Arthur Snowden that the extra distance they have to travel to Spencer-street would serve their purpose for freight traffic.

1797. You know that three-fourths of what is produced in those districts is perishable goods, there is no need to insist on the statement that they produce 120,000 or 130,000 tons of fruit, and it is increasing by leaps and bounds. Three-fourths of that fruit disposed of in the city of Melbourne, a great deal of it about Swanston-street and Collin-street; coming by rail now they have to cut their fruit down, to get it to the station, and any one who is acquainted with the nature of fruit knows that the more slashing it gets the worse it becomes, and they cannot get the same price for it?—I Join issue with you on that point for this reason—the bulk of the fruit goes to the Western Market, which is nearer Spencer-street than Flinders-street. I have a farm 12 miles from town where fruit is grown which comes in by train. I say if the railways are to be constructed for the sake of the fruit they will be a failure unless it can be shown the fruit will be sent out of the country. Fruit does not pay now for packing and sorting. Apples were sold off my farm for 6d. a case and 1s. a case. They did not average 1s. 6d. a case, and if people are to depend for a living upon the production of fruit, and the railways are to depend upon the fruit for their income, I am afraid the railways will never be able to produce much return.

1798. As to the population on both sides of the river, you think neither a railway nor a tram would pay.

1799. Here is a return showing the number in South Melbourne and Albert Park. There are 35,112 persons; they travel 48 times each on the railway and 57 times in the tram, making a total of 103 times a year for each person. There are 68,000 in the northern suburbs, or nearly double. They travel very less times each, what becomes of the others? do they walk or go by railway?—I say all the rest of the population unaccounted for in Fitzroy and Collingwood walk, and would walk even if the railway was there; people who walk now, who do not travel by tram, would still walk if the railway was there. I do not think it would increase the traffic appreciably by a railway coming through Collingwood or Fitzroy. It might take a percentage from the trains, but as far as increasing the bulk of the traffic goes, I do not think it would increase it at all.

1800. Then why do they not walk from South Melbourne?—There is a break between South Melbourne and Collingwood in the contiguity of buildings, 22 travelling through streets of buildings. A large number of people prefer to walk, but if there is an interval of half-a-mile with no buildings they naturally ride.

1801. You know the Esplanade line of trams? what was that originally?—A horse line.
1862. What did it cost?—I could not say; I was not on the Trust when it was constructed.

1863. They turned that into an ordinary cable line?—Yes.

1864. What did it cost?—I do not know.

1865. Who are responsible for the difference in cost between the horse tram and the cable tram?—The company, I believe, not any of them.

1866. That is included in the £1,650,000.

1867. Wre the Trust consulted in the matter?—Yes. It was an arrangement between the Trust and the company the Trust would pay, in consideration of the company paying the extra money, an extension of about two years. The company agreed to accept that and to pay the difference themselves.

1868. The municipalities on the northern side of the river agreed to that?—Their representatives.

1869. They are now equally responsible?—They are each responsible for the whole sum.

1870. Can you say whether that municipalities on the Trust are in favour of the northern suburb?—They are not. Collingwood, Fitzroy, Kew, and Hawthorn are the only ones who have expressed their opinion; Richmond would not express an opinion. There are eleven municipalities on the Trust, and, I think, five have I think refused to interfere in the matter, or advocated the construction of the line.

1871. Is the North Melbourne neutral?—It expressed its opposition to the line. I think five sent in notices of opposition to the last tramways Trust meeting.

1872. The Trust must consider it a very important matter; it communicated with every municipality in the colony?—No, only those represented on the Trust.

1873. They sent letters to all the shire councils in the colony?—Not the tramways Trust. I did not know that had been done until I got a letter from one of the Chairman's constituents who was inquiring about the matter, and he said this action emanated from Cranbourne.

1874. Are you a reader of the newspapers?—Yes.

1875. Have you seen in scores of cases where a letter from the Trust appeared before the municipal council?—No, not a letter from the Trust. The secretary of the Trust exceeded what he was ordinarily entitled to do and sent the resolution to the municipality outside the Trust radius.

1876. By the Hon. D. Melville?—You are the area of St. Kilda was equal to that of Fitzroy and Collingwood combined. When you knew Fitzroy, Collingwood, Heidelberg, Northcote, and Preston were also factors in this matter why did you not take the areas of the whole?—Because the principal agitation in connection with these lines, and the nearest pressure is brought to bear by Collingwood and Fitzroy, and by their density of population they can show a good case for a railway, unless it can be shown they have already facilities for roads which are equal to all that is required. As regards the areas of the other northern suburbs the question arises will there be people in this area in a reasonable time to create a traffic for the railways.

1877. Looking at that sketch on the blackboard you see the two direct lines of about 23 miles each. You have heard the time that Mr. Fitzpatrick, the Tramway Manager, says those points can be reached in. The question was put to Mr. Fitzpatrick what would be the quickest time in which a passenger going from Prince's bridge would reach Fitzroy? and he replied that to Grey street it would take two minutes, to Gerrily street four minutes, and Johnston Street six minutes?—I say I totally disagree with Mr. Fitzpatrick. Though he is an expert, I think he has included the stoppage of trains in the time.

1878. It goes on—"Are you able to maintain that safety?" and he replied, "Certainly." Will that help you?—It will not help me in deciding, and, in my own mind, I think Mr. Fitzpatrick must have been mistaken in calculating the stoppage of trains. The stoppage of trains is about one minute at each stop. I give an illustration that will tend to correct that at once. From St. Kilda to South Melbourne is about the same distance that you are indicating there, and, with the stoppages at Albert Park and Middle Park, it takes nine minutes or nine minutes and a half to come to South Melbourne.

1879. The whole distance is 23 miles?—I do not think it is 2 miles from South Melbourne to St. Kilda.

1880. Taking that horsebox head, are you prepared to condemn those 73,000 people for all time to travel round that circle when they could do it in six or seven minutes?—No; but I am prepared to condemn any large number of people who are the general public to construct a line for their service unless they are prepared to pay interest on the cost.

1881. If the Railway Department submit evidence of experts that this railway is not only to pay a dividend from the first, what do you say?—That is not the evidence that has appeared before you. If they are able to be made to pay, and you are satisfied that you will not have to pay interest on the line, I say they would be justified in getting it, although, from the tramway point of view, it is going to injure a very valuable property.

1882. If 73,000 are to be benefited, your opposition is gone?—No, but you are right in advocating it, because you can say—"We are satisfied it will pay the Government Department"; but that does not do away with the opposition to it.

1883. Are you surprised at the consequences of this railway on the tramways twenty years hence?—I am looking at the immediate loss that will occur at the present time from the additional construction of unpayable lines. There is a loss of over £250,000 per annum now.

1884. Are you surprised at the results when you come to pass the trains?—No; I shall not be here then. It will not matter some; but, from my children's point of view, I am satisfied to look at what will occur twenty or forty years hence, and I say that, inasmuch as the money has been spent on the lines, and it serves the purpose of the inner circle of municipalities, it is not right or just that the risk should be run of losing public money in constructing the lines. It is not a matter of twenty years hence. We are getting now at £330,000 or £400,000 a year from the rates and the saving on roads at the present time. I believe Melbourne will probably get £50,000 a year at the end of the time.

1885. Have you not found the railways to the southern suburbs a splendid developing agency?—I am told that the southern tram lines do not pay. Hitherto, the development has obtained as such, but the development will continue. If I see that these lines had been constructed six years since, it is not the same justification for them, because the trend of population was to extend in that direction; but not having been constructed then, and the smash having put Melbourne twenty years, there is no justification for them now.
1825. Have you not found the tramways and railways within the small population in the south a splendid developing agency together?—No, I have not found the tram in addition to the railways that already existed have increased the settlement of the districts through which they pass, because the population in those districts is smaller now than it was before the tramways were contrived.

1826. Those railways paid handsomely before the State got them?—I do not know that.

1827. The State bought the Hudson's Bay lines?—Yes.

1828. We had it paying up to 10 per cent, and the State became the owner?—Yes.

1829. The lines came in when those dividends were being paid?—Yes; many years ago.

1830. Have there municipalities not improved since then in landers and municipal assessments?

—During the boom period we improved in every direction. Since then we have gone back worse than we were in 1865.

1831. Are not the southern railways paying today?—I do not know.

1832. Can you say the tram does not pay?—I am prepared to say, not from my knowledge but from statements made by the officers of the company who know. I do not know personally.

1833. Have you any suspicion that the railways on the southern side or the trams do not pay?

—I have a suspicion that they do not pay now. I did not have that suspicion until yesterday.

1834. Then which side pays the £400,000 into the liquidating funds?—Chiefly the very lines that you propose to interfere with.

1835. The small population of 20,000 and 30,000 is a handsome thing for the tramways?—Yes. But I do not say the 20,000 and the 29,000 are the whole factors in the paying of those lines. The resolution of the Trust states that the best paying lines of the company are proposed to be interfered with.

1836. Question 293 says—Will any competition that they can set up in the tram affect that?—That is how we want to get the traffic. Fitzroy, 2 miles 10 chains, eight minutes?—That is Mr. Fitzpatrick's opinion, but it is not mine. Mr. Fitzpatrick's opinion is if they will furnish sufficient traffic from the railways to make it pay; my opinion is directly opposite, on the ground that the railway is from point to point, while the tramway is taking up and dropping people between those two points.

The witness withdraws.

John Pigdon, sworn and examined.

1837. By the Chairman. What are you?—I was a conductor, but now I am a gentleman. I reside in Colby. I have been there about fourteen years and I have been over 20 years in the colony.

1838. You have been appointed by the City Council to give evidence in opposition to the construction of the line of railway to the northern suburbs?—Yes. The council, as a body, think they would not be justified in allowing the money to be spent without protesting against it, owing to the great facilities the Fitzroy and Collingwood people have for travelling at present by the tram, and the municipalities being interested in the tram, the responsibility will be thrown upon them if they do not pay. I think the council has no objection, if mechanics can be given to extend the railway further north into the country, providing it can be made to pay, but the facilities for travelling to the people in Fitzroy and Collingwood are such that really they are not to be beaten in any part of the world. There is tram accommodation intersecting the whole of the streets. They are picking up and letting down as they go along. I myself, live right on the railway line; I have to pass over the railway to get to the tram, but in consequence of being able to get out at any part of the city I wish, I use the tram. I will get out at the Sarah Sants, travel down to the North Carlton line, from there go to Elgin-street, and from there to town. If I want to come right into the heart of the city, of course I take the railway, but the trams are more convenient, as a rule.

1839. Rather than go to Spencer-street and then going into the city by tram you would prefer coming straight down Elizabeth-street by tram?—Yes. I can get out to suit my convenience. Occasionally I have to come right into town, and then I take the railway and come straight in, but if I have business in the northern part of the city I take the tram, and then, perhaps, I take another tram and walk in, but the convenience of the tram is far more than the railway. You can get a tram every few minutes, and you drop off where you like, but with the railway the trains are so far apart that if you want to get into town, you must take a tram, or take a cab, because it will not pay to run the trams so often. From my own experience I say there's no city in the world that I know of that is better served that Melbourne for the travelling public. It is for the outer districts that want to get their produce into town, I say if you can improve the facilities you are justified in doing so, if you can do it at reasonable expense, but you must not expect the passenger traffic to make it up, because they will travel by the trains in preference to the railway.

1840. I presume you were an active member of the City Council at the time they were initiating the movement for constructing the tram?—I was.

1841. You were in favour of the tram?—Yes.

1842. Did you feel any interest in the railways at that time?—Decidedly.

1843. Notwithstanding that, you advocated the opposition to the railways in the southern suburbs?—While the Tramway Bill was before the House we had to look after the interests of the citizens to see that they got fair play, that there was no monopoly. We did not want to give a private company a monopoly and there was a great fight about the matter. Mr. J. J. Currie took a great interest in it, and I think we are indebted to him and many Members of Parliament for the privileges that we got at that time. I have not been approached by any member of the Tramway Company; I am not a shareholder, but, as a citizen and a ratepayer of the colony, I think we have a right to see that the money is not thrown away. I am a large ratepayer in the colony, and I want to see the colony progress, but I think you will admit that we are under a handicap as present with the railways, and I will not be a party to adding anything more to the expense of that. I must take exception to the Traffic Manager's estimate of the traffic. He makes out that they will come from Lygon-street to the Fitzroy line. They will not cross those tram lines to get to the railway.
station; they will get to town by tram in less time than they will get there, and perhaps just miss the train. If the revenue of the Department has to depend upon what you will receive out of this line it would be going to go begging. When the tramway people came before Parliament to get an amendment in their Bill there was a short line down Radnor-street, and in the conference we had with them I asked if they had any objection to extend that Radnor-street line right down to the bottom, as the Railway Bill was passed at that time and I thought there was a line coming in from Pearson, Whittaker, and Heidelberg, and the people could get out there where they were sure to put a station, and go to the city. Instead of doing that the member we had for Carlton at the time must have credit for having a railway station in Carlton, and he placed it nearer the cemetery than any where else, and I do not suppose any people in Carlton know there is a station there at all. If the fruit-growers could take the fruit out at the bottom of Nicholson-street and Radnor-street they could send it to any part of Fitzroy and Carlton. There is a large population in Carlton, Brunswick, and Fitzroy, and they could have a market for the stuff at once, instead of taking it down to Flioder-street where it is no use. At the present time the railways are more central for the Western Market, where the great sales take place, than any other place. If a station was put between Nicholson-street and Lygon-street it would pay much better than any where else. The people could then take either the Nicholson-street or the Radnor-street tram and go either to Fitzroy or Carlton and distribute their fruit. Putting the station where it is is simply throwing away money.

1844. By the Hon. D. Mclver.—Are you keeping in view that we have by the already constructed lines something like £25,000 a year in interest; that is the horseless load on sundry other lines outside?—I fail to see how we are going to save that £25,000 by making these lines.

1845. Suppose we show that we will not only gradually wipe out that deficit but make it also otherwise profitable; what would the council say then?—We would want some proof of that. I fail to see how you will get it. If you say the people will get in at Lygon-street and travel into town, I would not give anything for that proof.

1846. By the Chair—The Traffic Manager did not say west of Nicholson-street. The Engineer-in-Chief estimated for a line Lygon-street. As a resident there for 37 years I ought to know a little about it, and I fancy they will not do it, and if your evidence is based on that I say it is not worth much.

1847. By the Hon. D. Mclver.—One of the principal reasons for the construction of this line is to enable trains to wipe out that loss and turn it into a profit. We have examined Mr. Fitzpatrick upon this, and he says—"One of the strongest arguments in my mind why these lines should be constructed is that there are other lines that will never be remunerative except by making these. If you make 492 miles more you complete your recommendation, and you think the Department will get the trade?—Yes. You will save the loss?—I think we will gradually wipe it out. You are pretty well now to estimate what the train competition means in other districts and can estimate what it will be on this Collingwood and Fitzroy line?—Yes. You can make a pretty safe estimate as to your own income from those two lines if you construct both?—Yes; and I might add a further illustration to show that the estimate I have made is not too great. Would you like to debate that subject?—I have not read the evidence of the Engineer-in-Chief and the Traffic Manager.

1848. That being the object, would you like to defeat that object?—No. If you can show you can do it, I am with you.

1849. Do you know the total area of these suburban railways?—No.

1850. Mr. Reumick says:—If you take the north suburban lines, a length of 105 miles—that is to Port Melbourne, St. Kilda, Brighton, and Hawthorn—the revenue is £50,000 or £60,000 for 1883, and each mile of that represents £10,000; so, if you take £10,000 as the revenue for the north suburban lines, it seems to me to be a low estimate. Would you think that a low estimate?—That is low enough.

Property is cheap just now.

1851. You know the 105 miles of south suburban railways bring in about £300,000 a year?—Yes, but those suburban lines were made by private companies.

1852. Is that return satisfactory?—No.

1853. But those three things before you, are you afraid of this line?—Yes. Ten years ago I would have gone in for the Collingwood line.

1854. Do you know anything about the Income in 1883?—No: but I could see, making a general estimate, that it would have paid very well.

1855. Do you know that population is growing more now in all those places?—If you could see the steamers going out every week, that is what I am looking at.

1856. How many have they taken altogether from us?—I am sorry to say that they have taken the bulk of our last men. If I wanted 500 good working men at the present time, I do not know where I would get them.

1857. How many have they taken?—You know better than I do.

1858. In 1883 the population of Brunswick was 18,000; what is it to-day?—Very bad.

1859. It is 24,000; how does that tally with your idea?—Where are the people gone to that were occupying the houses that are standing empty now and not being pulled down?

1860. In 1883 the population of Brunswick was 18,000; to-day it is 24,000. What is there to fear there?—Then there must be two or three families living in one house. There are a number of houses coming down.

1861. Those are the municipal returns. Is it in Fitzroy that there has been a decrease?—There is a decrease in the whole population.

1862. Can you show that by those district the population is decreasing?—I know that the house and since, the best of our men, are leaving our shores. I can assure you there is no man has greater confidence in the colony than I have, but it takes time to get them back again, and if we are going to over-weight those people who are here at present to make up the deficiency in the railway revenue, we will never be under the sad together.

1863. Do you think these railways will ever be wanted?—I think the Collingwood line ought to have been done years ago. I question whether the Fitzroy line will ever be wanted.—I expect so.
1865. Do you think we are at the bad-rock of our depression?—I hope so.

1866. If so, when would you construct them?—Whenever you can buy cheap. No doubt the present is a good time to do that kind of thing. You can do everything very cheap. If I consulted my own interest I would say—"Go and get them both done, because I would make some profit indirectly," but the country itself must be looked to.

1867. Your interest is the same as everybody else's?—Yes, but I might reap a direct interest that other people might not do. I made a trip round the world two or three years ago, and I say, without fear of contradiction, that Melbourne is not excelled in any part of the world for facilities in travelling round the city.

The witness withdraws.

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

THURSDAY, 22ND OCTOBER, 1866.

Members present.

Mr. CAMERON, in the Chair;
The Hon. D. Melville, M.L.C.,
The Hon. E. Meroty, M.L.C.,
Mr. Burton,
Mr. Harris,
Mr. J. S. White.

John Lang, sworn and examined.

1868. By the Chairman.—What are you?—An ex-councillor of Collingwood.

1869. Do you live in Collingwood?—Yes, in 東Lincoln-street. I have lived there 36 years last January.

1870. You know Collingwood from one side to the other, and from one end to the other I suppose?—Yes.

1871. And Fitzroy also?—Pretty well.

1872. Do you know the country north of that?—Yes.

1873. Do you desire to make any statement to the Committee?—I might state that I have been before the Railways Standing Committee, in 1891, some three times I think. At that time we put in a valuation of property. A Mr. Hood and myself were appointed to value the property wanted for railway purposes at that time, and I have not heard of any decision of the route. There was a valuation put in at that time, but I must say that since that time property has considerably risen. A lot of the owners of property are neglecting to keep their properties in repair, thinking every year they will be required for railway purposes. I say that adversely, being a house and land agent. I could easily ascertain the difference in valuation between now and then if the route is still the same.

1874. It is pretty much the same, only it follows the Wellington-parade down to cooling-street instead of going past the Melbourne Cricket Ground?—The valuations we made were of the Collingwood proper properties. I may state that this last year our population has increased pretty well, 1,000 east of the proposed railway. I read in the papers it was said to be a sparsely populated district between the railway and the river. I took out the figures, and I find that east of the railway there are 13,500, while between the proposed line and Smith-street it is 18,000 only (so the population is not so very different), thus making a total of 31,500. A great many of those people are engaged in manufacturing, for we have upwards of 100 manufactories in Collingwood.

1875. How far did you go east of Victoria-street and Bridge-street in taking out that population?—You are speaking of Richmond; I am speaking of Collingwood.

1876. You do not come south at all?—No, not at present. In Collingwood proper, we have upwards of 100 manufactories, and there are employed there regularly, men, 1,972, women, 1,560, total 3,532. Casual hands are not included in that number. People working in shops and so on we do not include. I might state that the increase of buildings since the 1st of January, 1894, up to this year, east of the railway is 26, and west of the railway 26, but additions to buildings west of the railway are 90, east of the railway 88; that is, people putting on two or three rooms to their buildings.

1877. In that calculation you go west as far as Smith-street?—Yes. I do not place too much regard to Smith-street, because the population living there is not great. They are mostly business sites in that street.

1878. Can you give us afterwards the population between Smith-street and Wellington-street?—I did not take that out, but is easily ascertained. I understand that this proposed railway was to take by the cricket ground. I know, on the Collingwood ground for three Saturdays we had a large number of people—the papers say 10,090, but the secretary says more, though he did not say how many. Of course, that would bring a lot of people by train. There is one thing I wish to draw your attention to. If you look at the map, the first railway station from the townships, not speaking of the cricket ground, is between Highett and Elgin streets Richmond. I call that a fair walking distance from Melbourne, about a mile and an eighth. If you measure the same distance along the Fitzroy line that will take you to Collins-street, and that I would call a moderate walking distance, so that between those two stations and Collingwood there would be very little gathering ground for either of the lines. The populations that we expect to support the Collingwood route we number up to 66,000 odd. We are taking all the population of Collingwood in, but I have simply taken out the figures that are geographically lent towards the line. We do not go out of our way to make an impression.

1879. By Mr. Harris.—Do you cross the river?—I have taken 1,000 from Kew, that is across the river. That is the only thing we touch across the river.
1888. By Mr. Harris.—How far would that 1,000 be from the Kew railway station?—They are away north.

1889. What distance?—Perhaps a mile. It might be a doubt whether they would walk to Kew or Collingwood.

1890. By the Chairman.—As some of us know, the bounds just as well as yourself, if you would describe the extent and distance you go for that population, it would be better.—We take all the population of Collingwood, Heidelberg, 1,500, that is the gathering ground coming from Ivanhoe, Fairfield, Heidelberg, and so on. Then, coming within half-a-mile of the West Northern station, we take 6,500. That, of course, is conditional on the railroad bringing Northcote into Collingwood. From Preston we take 3,000; Whitlesson 1,800; North Fitzroy we take 2,000. There are a great many of those who come to the Clifton Hill station now. From Richmond we take 10,000. I suppose that is about as densely populated a portion as any. From East Melbourne we take, up to the east side, 3,000.

1891. How far do you go into Richmond to take the number you have stated?—In this case I know a great number walk, even from the boundary of Simpson’s-road, into town, and, so far as those go, the number would take from about Church-street.

1892. You do not go further east than Church-street?—No.

1893. Do you go as far south as Bridge-road?—Yes, and no further.

1894. What is the number for Preston?—Three thousand.

1895. Do you go beyond Preston?—Yes; you see you have two or three stations pretty well in Preston.

1896. If you are justified in including Preston people in Collingwood, why not take Epping. Do you know where that is?—Yes; I have been there; but we did not take that. We included what we call Preston and Whitlesson. That includes pretty well all up that line, because, if that line is connected with Collingwood, then those people would naturally come by it.

1897. Do you know a place called Templestowe?—Yes.

1898. Do you take people from there in Heidelberg?—Yes; the people come from Templestowe to Heidelberg now.

1899. You do not mention anything from there?—No. We are taking what is gathered at Heidelberg, station, and we get the whole of the population of Templestowe. I know some who travel to Templestowe and back to Heidelberg.

1900. I suppose, if you had a direct line, the people who travel by road now would travel by the line?—Yes, a good many of them.

1901. If you are justified in making an estimate, you are justified in showing where the people come from?—I have not taken from Epping and Templestowe, and so on. We take the number from Heidelberg, because they drive into Heidelberg, and are met there by their people on their return.

1902. Do you know the population of Templestowe?—About 300 or 400 would cover them all; there are not many.

1903. Is that all that you can show?—I speak of the township.

1904. Are there any in Templestowe who would go anywhere else but to Heidelberg?—I do not think so.

1905. You make no calculation about the Eltham shire?—No.

1906. Do you know the population there?—No, but it can be got from the municipal directory at any time.

1907. By Mr. J. S. White.—Have you not calculated the extra number that would travel if they had direct communication?—No; I have not anticipated anything of that kind.

1908. By Mr. Harris.—Would that take place?—Yes, I think so, people would travel oftener. I do not know that I have any further to say. You had the Collingwood evidence pretty well the other day. I have given the population and the nearest walking distances from the stations I have mentioned.

1909. By the Chairman.—Supposing there are the two lines made, Fitzroy and Collingwood, how far do you think it is reasonable to go for a feeding ground for the Collingwood line towards the Fitzroy line. If the line were in Young-street would you go as far as Smith-street, and take them down to Hoddle-street?—I do not think the Smith-street people would take either of the lines. They are business people, and I think they would take the quickest way into town.

1910. Which is the shortest?—That will have to be developed, the quickest way. Every man would know his time-table, and when he could get a train if he wanted to go to Bourke-street; and the train the same way.

1911. Are we to infer that if they wanted the quickest way to Melbourne they would go by train?—If it is the quickest they will go by train or by tram, which ever suits best. If you were engaged in business and wanted to get to a certain spot you would take the quickest way you could.

1912. If there were the two lines, the people of Smith-street would not go by either of them I do not say that, but that they would go the quickest way.

1913. Is it fair, if there were only one line, to take Smith-street to feed the Hoddlestreet line? I say there is not much of a population in Smith-street to feed either line. That would cut both ways, as far as Smith-street is concerned.

1914. By Mr. J. S. White.—Would they go down as far as Bulid-street. They would be nearer to Hoddle-street. If they wanted to go by tram to Melbourne and get out at Flinders-street, which train would they take?—If I lived in Bulid-street I would prefer walking down to Hoddle-street; it is a shorter distance and down half.

1915. Is it shorter from Bulid-street to Collingwood than to Young-street? I think so.

1916. Bulid-street is west of Wellington-street, and Wellington-street being the centre, Bulid-street must be nearer Fitzroy?—There is not much difference, there may be a little.

1917. If it was nearer the Fitzroy line and going towards Melbourne if you lived there, as the occupier of a house, had no more interest than as a tenant, which line would you go to?—I think, personally, I would go to the Collingwood line because I would avoid the tunnel, and I do not like tunnels.

1918. By the Chairman.—Wellington-street is exactly half-way between the two lines?—I was not aware of that.
1911. *By the Hon. D. McVicar.*—The Chairman asked you if there were any spur and two lines, to go over the feeding ground again, and you did not answer that. If there are to be two lines, he asked you to repeat the feeding ground for the Collingwood line. Will you take your list and tell us how you would provide there, in existence the two lines?—If you take Young-street, I do not know whether the proposal is to bring the Northcote traffic into Fitzroy or Collingwood.

1912. *By the Chairman.*—If there are two lines, you may depend that Northcote people would come into Fitzroy—Then you would bring in Brunswick and Coburg, too.

1913. *By the Hon. D. McVicar.*—You do not mean to say you are going to bring the Brunswick people into Collingwood?—You may give that up.

1914. Put your case in briefly and carefully. Suppose the two lines are constructed, what is your feeding ground for Collingwood?—I will give it. Heidelberg and Northcote East, and then we will get a portion of North Fitzroy, and we will get all Richmond and East Melbourne.

1915. From the list the population approximately so that we will know the feeding ground and the number of people. Do not strain it at all, but give it fairly and properly?—I do not want to strain it. In your numbers, say, 60,000. I am striking off half the number from Northcote, all Preston, and all Whittlesea.

1916. What have you in your last proposal?—From Northcote, 6,750; from Preston, 3,000, and 1,800 from Whittlesea. I am knocking off 6,000.

1917. If there are two lines, you have a population of 60,000. It was originally 66,000, now you make it 60,000; you have the whole, but 6,000?—Yes.

1918. It is something like the baby given to King Solomon; both of you claim the same thing; shall we cut it in two?—I am justified in taking East Northcote. I strike off Preston and Whittlesea altogether.

1919. *By the Chairman.*—Does that only make 6,000?—Yes.

1920. *By Mr. Barton.*—What is the station on the Heidelberg line?—Northcote. I claim them.

1921. *By the Hon. D. McVicar.*—You have 31,000 in Collingwood, to begin with?—Yes.

1922. What have you for Richmond?—I have 10,000.

1923. With the trains and railways?—Yes, the area is away over the hill.

1924. What is the total population of Heidelberg?—I forget exactly.

1925. How many have you put down for Heidelberg?—Four thousand three hundred.

1926. You have taken the entire population of the shire of Heidelberg?—They have no other way of coming unless they drive. Templestowe might come the same way.

1927. It seems strange why you do not appropriate the whole lot?—We will take it if we wish but we do not wish to exaggerate before this Committee.

1928. You take the entire shire of Heidelberg; they will come all through Collingwood you think, and half the population of Northcote?—Yes.

1929. The problem for us is to see to which of you it belongs?—Yes.

1930. *By the Chairman.*—It is not fair; half Northcote would not come to Collingwood?—A lot come now. I have taken for Northcote, 6,750.

1931. *By the Hon. D. McVicar.*—The whole population of Northcote must come to you. It is somewhere between 7,000 and 9,000 altogether I believe?—I am saying this much, that if you give us the loop-line to connect Northcote, then I am justified in claiming that number. I mentioned before you came in that I would appropriate the whole if there were a loop-line.

1932. Supposing there were two lines?—In this case I strike off the half.

1933. If you take the half of Northcote, do you take the half of all the people all the way up?—I struck off Preston and Whittlesea.

1934. Why?—Because they have a loop-line.

1935. What is your opinion? is there one line or two lines wanted?—The population, I believe, justifies two lines.

1936. Your evidence to-day seems to say if two lines are constructed; you get nearly all, whether you have one or two lines?—There is not much difference.

1937. What is your evidence to-day?—There is not much evidence that that line goes?—In favour of Collingwood.

1938. Only in favour of one line?—I have not touched the gathering ground of Fitzroy.

1939. If you made up the gathering ground to the Fitzroy line, after you take away yours, you would not leave them anything?—Yes. They too have all one part of the north, Preston and Whittlesea.

1940. What is the total to both lines?—I never touched the Fitzroy line.

1941. There are about 73,000 for both, and you claim 60,000?—I think I am entitled to do so.

1942. There is a population of 73,000 by taking the entire district, and you claim 60,000 and leave 1,000 for Fitzroy?—I think I am fairly entitled to take it, from our geographical position.

1943. The entire population of all the districts is 73,000, and you claim 66,000, and then you reduce it to 60,000?—We have a large area. We have at least 200 acres more than Fitzroy, and we are further away from business.

1944. *By Mr. Barton.*—If we decided that you were not entitled to the population between Wellington-street and Smith-street, would that reduce your estimate by 10,000?—No.

1945. Do you think there is not 10,000 between the two points?—No. There are, west of the proposed railway, 18,000, and between Wellington and Smith-streets is not the most populous part of Collingwood or of that division, and you would take away more than half.

1946. You would say 5,000 then?—Yes, that would be nearer.

1947. *By Mr. J. S. White.*—You said you took 10,000 from the North ward of Richmond?—Yes.

1948. It comes to Simpson’s road, Hoddle-street, and Bridge-road.

1949. You say you would get 10,000 by going down to Church-street.—Yes. Simpson’s-road would, perhaps, get more than that below Church-street.

1950. You say from Hoddle-street, bounded by Bridge-road, and running down to Church-street, that block would supply you with 10,000 people?—Yes.

1951. When there are only 9,000 in the ward altogether. The North ward has less than 9,000 from Simpson’s-road and along Bridge-road to the River Yarra; taking Victoria-street down to the river it is not 9,000. You are arguing about half that area, and you take 10,000 people?—I think you will find the ward goes a little below Church-street.
1951. That square down to the Yarn on the north side of bridge-road, including the town-hall and the post-office, past Hunter-street and the tram-sheds. You only go down to Church-street in Bridge-road, and yet you claim 10,000?—I was told there were over 10,000 people in that North ward, and I felt sure my informant was correct.

1952. There must be a mistake somewhere?—Yes; but in making inquiries these are the figures I got.

1953. By Mr. Harris.—Where did you get the figures?—From an old resident of Richmond, who promised to get them from the town-hall.

1954. I will put the question this way—you say there are 10,000 people calculated from Richmond and you do not go further than Church-street. How do you get the 10,000—the Government Statist says there are only 8,700 in the whole North ward, Hoddle-street on the west, the Yarn on the east, and Bridge-road on the south?—Possibly my informant may have given a little further south than Bridge-road is getting the numbers, because that is within a very little distance of the Highett-street station and a good distance to Swan-street station; but I think we are fairly entitled to take a few.

1955. By the Hon. D. Melville.—How many do you take?—I take 10,000, and there are only 8,700 in the ward. When I get that explanation then I should not exclude them, but I show you how I do it.

1956. By Mr. Harris.—If you take a certain number of population within certain bounds on the one hand, and the Government Statist gives information as to the population on the other hand, the difficulty is to check the two?—Yes, I see that.

1957. You state you are not sticking to the boundaries that I name?—Evidently, that cannot be.

1958. Can you give the boundaries you do adhere to?—No.

1959. You want or give an idea of the population within a certain area; you cannot go all over the country?—You see, across on the south side of Bridge-road there are only 1,200 or required to make up the 10,000. You would not require to go far in that leastly populated portion for them.

1960. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Do you think the 10,000 would object to give the necessary guarantee?—No. I have been speaking to several of the Richmond people, and the feeling given to me is that I do not think they would object.

1961. How would you deal with the city of Melbourne?—I cannot speak of them. Judging from their evidence, as given in the papers, they will not give the security if they can avoid it.

1962. Suppose they bar it by saying "No"?—They must devise some plan of getting over it.

1963. We are prepared to give a guarantee.

1964. Of course, you understand the guarantee is only the interest?—Yes. I do not think we would ever be called upon to pay it.

1965. You think the railway would be prosperous?—Yes, I do.

1966. About your ratespayers, are they increasing or diminishing?—Our population has increased close on 1,000 this year.

1967. Are your taxpayers increasing?—I think they are just about the level.

1968. They are not altering one way or the other?—Very little.

1969. How many years have they been as stated in Collingwood?—I should say four or five yours.

1970. Is your assessment increasing or diminishing?—Diminishing. This year it is much about the same as last year.

1971. How much has it diminished within the last five years?—I am not altogether clear on the amount, but I should say about £10,000.

1972. Is it readily £1,000 every year?—No.

1973. Have you only lost £1,000 in your assessment in five years?—I think so; I am not clear on the figures.

1974. Have you the gross assessment?—No. I left all those figures for his worship the mayor. You have had him before you; Mr. Cody is his name.

1975. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Have you been making this calculation yourself?—No. I got the population from the town clerk.

1976. Do you know what Fitzroy is?—No. I think a little over 29,000.

1977. Do you know what Collingwood is?—I think 30,000.

1978. What do you get from the population of Northcote, Heidelberg, Eltham, and Templestowe? We have a total of 20,114. What the Department wants to take from Richmond and Melbourne is 7,000, from Carlton 2,899, Brunswick 2,415, making a grand total of 29,098; so you think all that population would supply two railways?—I think it would. There is more population on the north than on the south, and they supply a good many lines.

1979. You have been making the question, and have made up your mind, I suppose, whether it is fair to give two lines or one. If it is to be only one line, you would say the Collingwood?—Yes.

1980. If there are 33,000 to be provided for, and they are fairly divided, would it be any, say 46,000 for each place—that would pay for a railway?—From what I read of the evidence by the experts of the Department that number would pay in passengers.

1981. Will there be anything else but passengers?—Yes. With our 100 manufactories in Collingwood you would have freight.

1982. You do not know what there is beyond the shape of agricultural produce?—In Collingwood, I supplied how many tons of wheat were sent in one year at the Yarn Flour Mills, and how many tons were sent out; that was in 1881.

1983. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Have you those figures for 1880?—No, I have not asked for it this time.

1984. Were they not stopped for six months?—I believe they have stated again and are as busy as they can be.

1985. By Mr. J. S. White.—Would they go to the Collingwood station or to Clifton Hill from the mill?—They have to go round to Spencer-street.

1986. You are not going to run a line down to the will?—There is one now from Collingwood, midway between Collingwood and Clifton Hill. It goes down on one side of Reilly-street.
1890. By the Hon. D. Méville.—Collingwood has fallen about £9,000 last year in the assessment?

—Yes.

1891. Has that being going on for some time?—There has been a gradual reduction for some years.

1892. By Mr. Harris.—But within a recent period?—Yes.

1893. Within the last two or three years would you call it?—The last year it was not so very much, but previous to that there has been a gradual reduction.

The witness withdrew.

David Baurnet, sworn and examined.

1894. By the Chairman.—What are you?—A mechanical engineer by occupation. I am living at present in Richmond.

1895. Do you know the districts that are called the northern suburbs, North Fitzroy, Northcote and Heidelberg?—Yes, I think I am tolerably familiar with them as far as Preston and Heidelberg, but I am better acquainted with the inner suburbs.

1896. What evidence do you desire to give?—I would endeavor to show that the present lines are not paying and that the only way to make them pay would be to provide a sufficient number of passengers from the northern suburbs. What I would call the inner area would be in a line with Park-street, and the other, or the outer area, would comprise Brunswick inclusive of Northcote and Northcote South.

1897. Do you think those districts are entitled to two lines?—I am inclined to support two lines, and hope to justify the position I take up, although I shall admit I have a partiality in favour of the Collingwood line, insomuch as I was the original proponent of that line. This is one reason, but not the principal one, and that is, I think the residents are fairly entitled to direct communication as can be given to them.

1898. Will you set forth your reasons for thinking they are entitled to two lines?—In the first place, as to the direction of the lines, I do not know that I am justified in going into that; that is more a professional matter. I am of opinion that a station in Wellington-lands would not pay, taking into consideration the size of the population, and the probability of their not travelling by rail to the city.

1899. This is the station to take in and let out the people who visit the Melbourne Cricket Ground?—No. I am in favour of a line between that and Johnston. First, it would supply the Railway Department with a large number of passengers on Saturday afternoons when the trains were not otherwise engaged, and would be far cheaper in its construction.

1900. How much longer would it make the distance?—I am not prepared to give the number of chains, but it would lessen the cost. It would form the axis of a circle, the chord of which would be 66, and the height about 14. It would make a difference of perhaps a couple of chains, but it would lessen the cost of construction, because it is the line that is intended to be constructed at the Johnston-road; the deviation would commence there, and the cutting would not be more than 8 or 10 feet, until well east of the cricket ground, it got to the tunnel; the other would involve a cutting at the intersection of Clarendon-street, which I think would be 45 feet deep.

1901. You say if it went south of the cricket ground?—North, at the back of the pavilion, the original proposal.

1902. Would that not make it more than a few chains longer?—No. I have not calculated it out, but it would not be a very difficult matter. The amount to be constructed would be less, because you would only require to construct from the east side of Johnston-road, whereas in the case of going on Wellington-lands it would not only be through a deep cutting, but you would have to construct to the junction of the Fitzroy line almost to the end of Spring-street. The construction would be less through the back of the cricket ground, and the cost of construction less on account of the less cutting. As to the stations, I say, in my opinion, the station in Wellington-lands would not pay, on account of the small number of residents in East Melbourne and Johnston who would use it.

1903. By the Hon. D. Méville.—And on account of the composition of the trade?—Yes, that is an element to be taken into consideration; but I will take that afterwards. On the proposed Collingwood line, I understand there is to be one station near Haightstreet, one near Victoria-street, and one at Johnston-street.

1904. By the Chairman.—The placing of the stations is not here or there, because their positions may be altered?—I think a station between Gipsy-street and Langridge-street would probably be worth consideration, because it would take in population between Victoria and Johnston streets; it is somewhere about halfway. It would not be very far from the present town ball in Collingwood. The same reasoning, I think, would apply to the station on the proposed Fitzroy line at Gray-street. I do not think that the population there would be worth putting a station for, because those to the west of the line, near Melbourne, would certainly not walk eastward when a short walk would take them to the top of Bourke-street. They might secure a few passengers, perhaps, from the two colleges; but, as they would travel at very reduced rates, I think that itself would not be sufficient to justify a station. During the sitting of Parliament they might secure a few Members of Parliament.

1905. Do not hesitate about where the stations should be; confine yourself to showing whether a line would pay?—The next point is the lines on the present lines, and what saving would be effected by the proposed alteration, as submitted to the Committee the other day. I take the figures as submitted on behalf of Fitzroy as favour of construction of the whole of the line through Fitzroy, and I see the population given was 84,554. From that I should say the whole of East Carlton, from Nicholson-street to Station-street, should be deducted, because there are two lines of track, and it is not likely passengers would travel from Nicholson-street east to Young-street, when they could get the trains nearer, and the Rathdowne-street line is the quickest on the system. East Melbourne might very well be deducted, that is, 420 people, because the station would not pay. North Carlton is taken from Richardson-street to Park-street, and I think 1,000 might be eliminated from there, because either the station at North Carlton or North Fitzroy is too far off to justify the people going to North Carlton or North Fitzroy. In southwest Fitzroy, the portion west of Brunswick-street and north to Moor-street, a considerable number might
be eliminated from the estimate, because they could walk to the top of Bourke-street and catch a tram from there quickly. A question would arise as to the line from East Melbourne to Collingwood, and should not be included in Fitzroy and Brunswick, and Collingwood. $13,500 should be deducted because, with the proposed alterations, the saving would only be 30 chains in distance, and it would not be any great advantage to the Brunswick or Collingwood resident to go to Princes' bridge instead of the Spencer-street bridge. A great many would be found to be employed at the factories south of the Yarra, and they are better served by going round by Spencer-street than by taking them to the other side. That would eliminate $1,950, leaving $21,436 as the population to be supplied by the direct line through Fitzroy. If the $12,500 to be taken through Fitzroy from Clifton Hill are divided between the districts, and not entirely supplied by residents of the Collingwood population, to be served by the Collingwood line, it would increase the amount to $41,641 to be served by the Collingwood line. The fares at present on the northern suburban lines, taking the average fare for day return tickets, and taking first and second class in equal numbers, averages $3.60 per mile, or less than three-eighths of a penny per mile.

1902. By the Hon. D. McVicar.—What are you calculating, up to Melbourne from Collingwood?—Taking the average distances of the stations, and the average station between Royal Park and Collingwood, not including beyond, is 4 1/2 miles; that is, South Brunswick, Brunswick, Moreland, and Collingwood.

1903. The total distance from Melbourne to Morleigh is 44 miles?—There must be other stations.

1904. Where would you begin?—From Fitzroy-street, because they are carried there at no extra cost.

1906. It is 4 miles from the Melbourne Post Office to South Brunswick; what do you charge people on the average?—On that line, for day return.

1907. How many miles?—Five and a quarter is the average mileage, taken from the time-tables; that is, the average between South Brunswick and Collingwood.

1908. If you take from South Brunswick, to Collingwood, it is nonsense?—From Fitzroy-street to a point midway between the two stations.

1909. By Mr. Burton.—What is the cost of the railway on which you do away with?—I trust I will be able to show how it can be utilized, and the passenger increased. The average fare from the average distance between the Royal Park and Collingwood, by monthly ticket only amounts to something under 3, a mile. Including Collingwood it only amounts to 3 1/2 a mile. The railway return shows it is considerably under that. The returns from the last railway report show that Montreal, 46 miles, only gives 137 cts, or 29 1/2 cts per mile for one way, and the same thing applies to Collingwood.

1910. By Mr. J. S. White.—That is the cheapest travelling in the world?—No; I will show you cheaper travelling on another line in the colony. The saving to be effected by taking the Collingwood and Brunswick people by the new loop would only amount by day return to 22 cts, or three dollars a mile, or something under a shilling, in mileage, and a similar result would follow in the case of Northcote, upon the Preston to Clifton Hill line. The average fare from Northcote to Regent-street, 71 miles, taking the double journey, is only 27 1/2 a penny per mile, while for monthly tickets it is 20 1/2, or considerably less than a farthing a mile. The saving to be effected by going through Fitzroy would be, in the case of a day return, two-fifteenths of a penny a mile, and, in the case of monthly tickets, one-twentieth of a penny per mile.

1911. By the Hon. D. McVicar.—Could you give us the aggregate savings; the diminutions are hardly fit for us?—I have not taken out the aggregate saving, but I would be happy to supply the Committee with any information at a later stage. Speaking of the question of fares which has been raised, the railway is carrying passengers from Regent-street, on the Preston Melbourne line, on monthly tickets, at one-tenth of a penny per mile. The number of passengers I find by a railway return travelling from Coburg to Melbourne (I presume they are day return passengers) gives an average of 2,158 per day, or, reckoning 312 days per annum, a total of 665,684 per annum, or 91 1/2 per train, so that at the present rates they would not pay the Department. On the Preston line the people travelling are 652,930 per annum, or 2,052 per day, which gives 225 per train. To fill the trains to their full earning capacity Fitzroy would have to supply to Collingwood line 3,069 passengers per day, or 15,365 altogether, to fill the trains to 867 passengers per train. That is to show that Fitzroy could not supply the population to do it. But two-thirds full, Fitzroy would have to supply 5,948 to the Collingwood line. To fill the Heidelberg line they would have to supply to fill the trains to their full earning capacity 6,166, and to fill them to two-thirds of their earning capacity they would have to supply 3,936. Fitzroy, therefore, with a population of 28,604 would have to supply one out of every one and eight-tenths of its inhabitants to fill the Preston and Coburg trains up to their full carrying capacity. Taking the Collingwood line, the Heidelberg line supplies 299,043 passengers per annum, or 74 per train. To fill those trains to their full earning capacity, Collingwood would have to supply 6,696 passengers per day, or to fill them to two-thirds of their earning capacity 4,464 passengers per day. If the three lines were combined through Fitzroy, Fitzroy would have to supply 22,185 passengers per day to fill the trains to their full earning capacity, or to fill them to two-thirds of their earning capacity they would have to supply 12,769 passengers, that is at 320 passengers per train, which is as little as will pay to run a train.

1912. You are giving evidence against the lines?—I am giving evidence to show that by turning the lines on to the Fitzroy line, Fitzroy could not supply sufficient passengers to supply the trains, and I want to show that by a better arrangement of the traffic, leaving the Heidelberg people to be carried by the Collingwood line (and I want to support two lines) Collingwood would supply the trains on the Heidelberg line, and Fitzroy would supply the other lines in another way. I will try to show a reduction of working expenses per train mile, and the useless running of heavy trains to sparsely populated districts. The running of heavy trains to terminal points involves a heavy loss. On the south suburban lines a train weighs 129 tons without the engine, that is four first class carriages of 19 tons each, end, one first class of 10 tons, and four second class of 10 tons, equal to 40 tons, that is 129 tons. The engine would have to run in any case.

1913. Give the weight of the engine and tender?—I cannot give that. I am taking these figures from the figures on the railway caiirages.
2014. By Mr. J. S. White.—This is on the Brighton line?—Either the Brighton or the Camberwell; they have both the same number of carriages.

2015. By the Hon. E. Marry.—Do you know the weight of the engines, as an engineer?—No; I would not know the weight of the carriages, except they have an official record on the carriage themselves. But the engine has to travel itself in any case. I am only showing what the engine has to haul besides the loading.

2016. What about the tender?—To use an engine with a tender for light passenger trains is a mistake.

2017. We want the weight of the train before they get the passengers?—I want to show the waste of horsepower in drawing 120 tons down to Brighton for a few passengers.

2018. Suppose there were a lot of passengers taken down and not enough accommodation to bring them back?—At holiday times they can afford it, because they get a great number both ways. On the north suburban lines the weight of the trains is, one first class carriage, 19 tons 16 cwt, five second class carriages, and one guard's van, making a total weight of 59 tons 16 cwt, and they have to draw that from the verge of the inner area at Park Street to Coburg on one line, and to Preston Reservoir on the other, and yet I have shown you the number of passengers. Therefore, the passengers on the Coburg line is in the proportion of 1 to 1 of dead weight, and on the Preston line it is 1.5 to 1 of dead weight.

2019. By the Hon. D. Metcalfe.—That is, the machine that hauls the man has 1 ton of dead weight to carry 1.5 of a man?—Yes; that is where the leakage comes in.

2020. That phase of the question is more interesting, I think, to Mr. Matheson than to us at the present time!—I am done with it now because I am omitting a considerable portion of the details which I have prepared. I must admit it is beyond the scope of the present Committee's inquiry, and not altogether leading up to the point I wish to establish. What I want to suggest, in the way of saving train mileage and working expenses, is, in place of diverting those three lines into Fitzroy, or two lines into Fitzroy or Collingwood, the following arrangement should be carried out:—Let the Collingwood line be constructed to supply its own passengers, Richmond and Heidelberg, and so on; Fitzroy to be connected to supply Preston and district beyond, and Coburg and Brunswick to be supplied as I have shown later on. I would suggest that, in the place of running the trains on each of the lines at the full weight (and at present there are 24 trains a day to Coburg, 17 a day to Preston, and 16 per day to Heidelberg, in all 57 trains per day to supply those three outer lines) the Collingwood line should be allowed to supply the Heidelberg passengers with 16 trains a day.

2021. That is the Department's proposal; you are only wasting your own time and that of the Committee by all this?—I am coming to a new proposal. To supply the present requirements of Coburg and Preston requires 24 trains a day to Coburg and 17 to Preston, or 41 in all. In place of running those trains all the way to Preston and Coburg respectively, I submit a great saving would be effected to the Railway Department by constructing the Fitzroy line and using it as a circular line, drawing a cordon round the whole city, and using for Fitzroy the inter-suburban traffic. The saving would be considerable, because there would be no slumbering. The outer train would be continuously travelling to the right, and the other to the left, passing each other at North Carlton. Connect the lines at Royal Park for Brunswick and Coburg, and at North Fitzroy for Preston with light trains with very light rolling-stock, chiefly on the model of the tramway cars, or move on the model of the Sydney tramway cars, which are larger (not the two-storey, but the one-storey). Conveying about 60 passengers each. If that class of rolling-stock were used to connect at Royal Park for Preston and Royal Park, there would be no difficulty in reducing the cost from 3s. 5d. to 1s. 6d. a mile. Using light engines, the same as on the Burnley line, there would be a saving in running, because there is only one engine for light engines, and it would cause less wear and tear on the permanent way.

2022. By Mr. J. S. White.—What do you mean by one engine?—Some people call those engines motors.

2023. Is there no fireman?—No.

2024. By the Hon. D. Metcalfe.—The Department are proposing this very thing?—In the western part towards Spencer-street?

2025. You are getting in nothing new?—Yes. I am getting this in, that I propose to run from Royal Park to Flanders-street.

2026. By the Hon. E. Marry.—You would not trust our lives to one man surely?—I am only speaking of what I saw at Burnley.

2027. In the case of hundreds of women and children travelling, if anything went wrong with that man, what would you do?—They have allowed it.

2028. By the Hon. D. Metcalfe.—You are giving the Committee matters that are more Mr. Matheson's business; if you had an interview with him it would be better?—I have not much more to say. I was only wishing to show the saving that would be effected. I want to show that by constructing the Fitzroy line you could effect a saving.

2029. Your evidence goes then to support the Fitzroy line?—Yes, leaving the Collingwood line to take the Heidelberg traffic. The present running on the Collingwood line is 339 miles a day, on the Preston line 392 miles a day, and on the Heidelberg line 416 miles a day, or 1,117 miles a day in all. By the scheme submitted by Mr. McMahon, the train mileage would be reduced by Coburg to 327 miles a day, Preston 293, and Heidelberg 226, making altogether 942 miles a day, or a reduction in the train mileage of 274 miles per day, but that is to be added the light lines running from Royal Park to Flanders-street, say 20 trains a day, or 72 miles. The actual running would be 779 miles, omitting the Heidelberg line. By the proposed Fitzroy scheme the heavy trains would travel 607 miles; by the proposal I submitted, making it a circular line, they would run 414 miles, so the saving would be 163 a day. By the Fitzroy scheme the light running trains would travel 172 miles; by my proposal the light trains from Royal Park to Coburg and North Fitzroy to Preston, would be 302 miles, an increase on the light running of 130 miles. The saving would be 163 miles at 3s. 5d., and three shillings and sixpence, deduct 130 miles of light running at 1s. 5d. amounting to £11 7s., having a saving of £16 10s. a day, or for 312 days, £5,194 16s. per annum. I do not know that I have anything more to add, but if you have any questions to ask me I will answer them, or if you want any information I will be glad to supply it.

2030. By the Chairman.—We may, perhaps, call you again?—Very good.
2031. By Mr. J. S. White.—Do you include the light rolling-stock for your inner circle?—If a payable number of passengers are carried you would have the heavy rolling-stock. My proposal is to use the light traffic for going to the outer suburbs.

2032. Would you lift the present rails and put light ones down?—No. You have to provide at Preston for Whitelines, and on the Coburg line the same, so there would be no great saving in that.

2033. If the Committee consider it necessary to construct one line only, which would pay the best—I think the Collingwood line, inasmuch as it is the cheaper constructed, and they would get an equal number of passengers from the inner roads, North Richmond, Collingwood, and Clifton Hill, greater than on the Fitzroy line, including Fitzroy, North Fitzroy, and what little portion of Brunswick and Coburg they could claim.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Tuesday next, at half-past eleven o'clock.

TUESDAY, 27TH OCTOBER, 1886.

Members present:

Mr. Cameron, in the Chair;

The Hon. D. McIlwraith, M.L.C., Mr. Burton;

The Hon. E. Morley, M.L.C., Mr. Craven;

Mr. Hurst, Mr. Harri.

Mr. J. S. White.

John Clayton, sworn and examined.

2034. By the Chairman.—What are you?—Town Clerk of Melbourne.

2035. How long have you held that position?—Between five and six years.

2036. Do you know the district called the northern suburbs?—Yes. Might I make a suggestion for a moment? I have jotted down a few notes; would it be out of place to let me run through those, or would you prefer taking my evidence in your own way?

2037. You may as well read your statement?—I have taken down a few notes which appear to me to be in sequence. I am authorized by the council to attend here to-day as one of its representatives. The council's resolution on this matter was not one of opposition to the construction of a railway to the northern suburbs; nor is there any opposition on the part of the council to the northern suburbs having railway communication. What was before the council was the two proposed lines, and it was in regard to those that the council adopted a resolution in opposition thereto. I may mention that because I thought there was some little misunderstanding and that the Committee thought that the council was opposed to the northern suburbs having railway communication.

2038. I may say at once my impression was that the City Council sent three gentlemen here to oppose any railway communication whatever being given to the northern suburbs?—I thought as much, and I wanted to correct what was an erroneous impression.

2039. It seemed to me to be a monstrous thing for the council to do?—I thought the Committee had forced some such opinions, so I mentioned the matter to my colleagues, and it is with their approval I am here to-day to state this. Our opposition is what may be said to be on three grounds—

(1) A liability in connection with the tramways, which was made mention of by the other representatives; (2) their guarantee, or a proposal for a guarantee, under the Railways Construction Act; and the third, although a minor point, the injury to certain parks and public reserves which we have got. Dealing with those three points, then, the council's liability, in common with other councils, for the tramway system is a heavy one. The capital is £1,630,000, the annual interest is about £76,000, and the sinking fund runs out somewhere about £30,000; it varies. In addition to that, at the present moment we are deriving a rating from the annual assessment of from £80,000 to £100,000, divided between the various municipalities, so long as the system is in its present occupation.

2040. By the Hon. D. McIlwraith.—How much money comes from that?—I cannot give that because our rates vary.

2041. You say an annual assessment of from £80,000 to £100,000?—Yes. I cannot give the exact figures because, as you know, it has been a matter of very extensive appeals both to the County and the Supreme Courts.

2042. Who could give us that?—I could give it, but I would have to get it from the other municipalities. Our rate is 1s., and 3½d. lighting rate.

2043. Have you your own accounts?—No, but I can get it for you. So you see our immediate liability, in the event of anything happening to make the tramways unprofitable, would be the redemption of the loans, a loss of rating, and the great benefits which we derive under our agreement in the shape of street maintenance, the company, of course, being required, in addition to the contributions I have mentioned, to maintain the 1½ mile of the roadway occupied by them. Our prospective liabilities at the end of twenty years would be, if there is anything at all, our depreciated undertakings. That is too remote for us to say anything about this stage. With regard to the tramway system, what we fear is the effect of the competition of the lines or the routes now proposed, and the Committee will not mind my repeating that it is only a question of the particular route proposed we speak of. The capital is expended for the tramways, and if the proposed lines be constructed the capital for them, will have been expended also, and both parties must endeavour to get the traffic in order to make the best of their bargain. The effect will be the fares must be cut down, and, in some cases, until they are unprofitable, and there will be a reduction in working expenses, say, off wages and other working expenses. We feel that that cannot be compensated for by any increase in traffic because, in the area through which these lines go (speaking of only the section nearer to the city) the population cannot be increased appreciably. Taking Johnston-street as the northern line, I feel that there is no scope for increasing the traffic anywhere on those lines south of Johnston-street, because, figuratively speaking, every inch of the country is built on. Any excess in the way of filling up empty houses is only a temporary affair. The circumstances are so different
from what they were on the Coburg line. On that line the competition I speak of was band to a
foot; but there was a tremendous territory at the end of that line to serve both the services—the
railway and the tramways—with the result that although fares have been very much cut down, the
Tramway Company's by 33 per cent., for ordinary fares and 20 per cent., on the daily return system, yet
they had not made more money which, but for their going out there, would not have been peopled.
That helps to make up what would otherwise have been a loss. I know they have come to that
reduction of the fares on the Coburg line has absolutely driven the revenue from their parallel line in
Katoomba-street. Any one a regular traveller living near the Coburg tram goes across to it and saves 50
per cent., and I feel that how the Coburg line is doing better than it would otherwise do.
2014. Do you know how much better the Coburg line is since the reduction?—Very much better
in the number of travellers, but not much better in the matter of revenue.
2015. You knew that to be so?—I made an inquiry as to that.
2016. Did they give you the figures?—I did not ask for the returns. The effect of the construc-
tion of the proposed lines would therefore be, as regards the southern portion of them, that they and the
tramways would have to divide the existing traffic. Unless you can increase your traffic, a division between
two services must necessarily mean a reduction in the revenue of each. That is as far as I propose to go,
touching the tramways, at this stage. On the second ground, our Liability for the guarantee, and the more
national ground of a loss to the colony, if the lines be unprofitable. It may be necessary to repeat again that
the objection of the City Council applies only to the southern portion of those lines, say, from Reilly-street.
I am now speaking of the stations and traffic south of that. In that portion, I feel certain that the traffic
will not pay because of the competition, that is, competition with an existing service—which certainly is
an excessively convenient one, speaking generally. The effect of such a competition, from railway point of
view, is, I think, somewhat strikingly shown by a comparison between different stations. If we take
the Coburg and Preston lines, on the one hand, the return fares to which are 2d. and 3d., we find they
have to carry the people 6½ miles and 9½ miles each way, whilst to South Melbourne, where there is not
that competition, they carry them 1½ miles each way for the same money: to Richmond, 1½ miles, for the
same money; to Port Melbourne, 2½ miles, and Burnley, 2½ miles, for the same money. From a railway
point of view, if it is worth 4d. to carry a passenger to South Melbourne, 1½ miles, and back, or to Burnley,
2½ miles, and back, surely it must be worth more to go 6½ miles or 9½ miles to Preston.
2017. Why not let the Government do the shorter distance to Fitzroy and charge it—why not let
them run one of the new lines and do the shorter distance for the money?—The only difference is, that in the
case I have cited in the south, you have no tramway competition in parallel lines; but in the case I
referred to in the north you have, which will have the effect that the Railway Department could not charge
these fares.
2018. The point I took exception to was to point out the high price for 6½ and 9½ miles. If the
lines are constructed you have 2½ miles loss to drag your passengers for the same revenue?—I show if
you run the lines in South Melbourne at parallel rates you will have a loss.
2019. You have to carry your passenger 9½ miles now for 4½d., but if we construct this 2½ miles, we
have only to carry the passenger for 4½d. and 3d. 2½ miles less?—That is not in substitution of the Coburg
2020. We are speaking of an additional line, and I am showing the result. It is proposed to
Preston lines. We are speaking of an additional line, and I am showing the result. It is proposed to
construct an additional line, not on the same system as the South Melbourne and Burnley, but on the
system of the Coburg line, namely, parallel with a tram; which means the fares will come down, and
that you cannot get the South Melbourne rates.
2023. You are assuming that there is no tramway competition on the Port Melbourne route?—
Neither is there, to the same extent.
2024. Is not the tram running along the Sandridge-road the same?—No.
2025. What is the difference between the Sydney-road tram and the Port Melbourne tram?—
Because, in the first case, the two are running alongside each other. In the Port Melbourne case you find
they are running at the interjections, and, as an able, I may say that, in my opinion, I am backed up
by more competent authorities, that if the Tramway Company charged similar fares to South Melbourne
as to Coburg, the Albert Park station would show it in a result.
2026. There is a line distinction you are showing. The two railways are within a few hundred feet,
say 600 feet of trams. The Coburg line is all along the Sydney-road, and the Port Melbourne line is in
the same position exactly. You could not get worse competition by tram than on the Sandridge-road?—If
you look at the scale you will see is at least double the distance at Port Melbourne on the average. I am
referring now to South Melbourne as different from Port Melbourne; and if you remember, I referred particularly
to South Melbourne as 1½ miles. If you look at that piece, you will see there is a very great difference
between them.
2028. Your distinction between 600 feet or 600 feet on the Coburg and Port Melbourne lines
appears to be a very nice one?—Will you kindly take the South Melbourne first, which is 1½ miles; that
is the one I am quoting. South Melbourne and Richmond are the two I quote, and you charge the same
fare to carry people 1½ miles and 1½ miles that you are compelled to carry them 6½ miles and 9½ miles in
the northern district for.
2029. You admitted that, as far as the trams are concerned, they have suffered no loss on the
Coburg line?—No, they have suffered no loss of revenue, but they have a great deal more to do for the money.
2030. Would the competition be any more severe on that Fitzroy line with the trams than it is on
the Coburg line?—Yes.
2031. Mr. White, if correct, says for 3 miles the Coburg line is running within 300 feet of the
trams?—That will not alter the fact, because on the Coburg line they have the reward of a big area at the
end, and on the Fitzroy line they will not.
2032. Is it possible that the competition can be greater on the Fitzroy line when 3 miles on the
Coburg line is 600 feet between them, though Mr. White says it is 300 feet?—Yes, unmis-
takably, because that is a railway line in the midst of three tram lines. In Coburg it is a railway and one
tram line in the same area; in the Fitzroy line you have two if not three lines of tramway and one line of
railway.
2033. The wonderful result is that you have had to say this morning that by some means both
have gained in passengers?—Yes, because they have opened up new country, which the Fitzroy line will
not do.
2090. When you say that, have you looked over the wall on the great area in the direction of the North, and on the west of the Railway? I remind you I said to the north of Rolly's Street, and the fact that as I never do look at anything.

2091. A railway is no use except at its station; and I would like the distances from the trains at the station point where the passengers want. What I want to point out is that I refer to the South Melbourne line, which has not a parallel line; and two lines which only clash at the crossing points are very common; two lines which are running parallel all the way, and more especially when the two lines which only clash at crossing points are through densely populated country all the way.

2092. You take off the back country; you are only speaking of the Fitzroy traffic? I said I was simply referring to the same stations. Of course, the outer traffic may be shown by experts and by persons who know all about it, which I do not, to pay so heavily as to justify the colony in constructing some less busy intermediate stations.

2093. You, for the moment, do not take the country traffic at all? No.

2094. Suppose the traffic is overwhelming, what then? By all means construct a line. I am speaking now from the rational point of view. I am speaking now from the rational point of view. I am speaking now from the rational point of view. I am speaking now from the rational point of view.

2095. By Mr. J. S. White.—What you mean to say by constructing the line is if there is an increase of population? If there is sufficient to pay for the line and a connecting link between it and Melbourne, by all means construct it.

2096. If the fares were 1d., instead of 5d., taking too fare from somewhere else, what then?—I say as far as the lines are concerned south of Johnson Street, and perhaps even south of Rolly's street, that the lines will not derive any benefit from them, but they will have to depend on all the northern traffic, from my point of view, to make them a success. I suppose, in speaking of the line, I have a right to assume that it will have a suburban service; if not, it will be no use to Fitzroy or Collingwood. Fifteen or twenty trains only a day will be of no use to these places.

2097. By Mr. Harris. M. D. Melville.—With the Department that monthly ticket allows them to travel as often as they like, and they can go home to lunch, which the working men do on the Coburg line?—Very few working men, I think, go home to lunch.

2098. I believe they do—that is between twelve and two. All our trains are well patronized then.—I would point out one set-off against that is if a husband has a monthly ticket and the wife and family travel with him they have to travel on single tickets.

2099. On the Coburg line the wife gets her ticket for 3s. 6d., and there are some other concessions?—I have not had the benefit of those in my family yet. The next point is, it seemed to me, that the traffic would settle pay as to the nearest railway stations for the want of convenience; in other words, that the concessions afforded by the railway system are so immeasurably superior to what the railway service would give that so far as the southern portion of this traffic is concerned nothing but a tremendous reduction in fares would draw it away from the tramway. Take the Johnson-street station as an illustration; a person gets in at Johnson Street, is landed at Flemington Street, and has to come back to Bourke Street. Now, he takes his train and is landed in Bourke Street or any of the streets at the fact that he can get to no less than three transfer to take him to any part of the city. To a casual traveller that is an immense advantage, and, if a regular traveller, he will take the train which takes him nearest to his business. Then there is the frequency of return traffic against the railway service, even with a suburban service. Taking Port Melbourne and St. Kilda, the average service is about a quarter of an hour, ranging to twenty minutes, and half-an-hour at other times. Now, the headway of our rail lines range from three minutes and a half up to six minutes on the Johnson Street line, and from three minutes and a quarter up to four minutes and a half on the Smith Street line.

2100. The time expended on the journey?—The time expended on the journey is balanced by the fact—

2101. That is the time? I have not got that; I do not know it. I only want to see the frequency of the cars against one of our best suburban services. I do not refer to South Yarra, which is excepted altogether, but will take the Coburg line. According to the time-table trains run at 6.50, 7.15, 7.45, 8.15, 8.50, and 9.20 in the morning, at intervals amounting up to 30 minutes; and unless there is going to be a special suburban service on these lines, I take it the northern suburbs will not come in more frequently. Then, with regard to what will be a large item for either tram or railway, that is the theatre or night traffic, the whole of that is concentrated into Bourke Street, because anything that goes down to the station than Bourke Street is zero than communicated by the Princess Theatre and Parliament House or places of popular resort. If you look at that you will find a great portion is infinitely better provided for by the tramway service from either of the districts aforesaid than by the proposed lines. As to the traffic which is to be drawn to these lines, either I do not rightly understand the evidence which has been given, or there must be some little mistake in it, surely. The Engineers-in-Chief (at page 1) spoke about the traffic coming from Lygon Street to go to Young Street railway. He simply walks over three parallel lines of tramway to catch a train that starts at five minutes intervals. That is question No. 2.

2102. That is, "What is the most westerly point to which you go?"—Nicholson Street, I suppose it is, running past the Exhibition, and when you get up to Carlton, go over to, I suppose, Lygon Street?—I say yes, these tram lines to catch a train running at such low frequency intervals. Then at question 22 I can hardly understand this: the population is said to be 40,000 to be served by the Fitzroy line, and 40,000 to the Collingwood line, while the total population of the whole of Fitzroy and Collingwood is under 100,000. It is intended to apply to all that, I think, is the extreme north, but I think it cannot be. If you speak of those lines only, I find it hard to see how it can be stretched to 50,000.

2103. He would be entitled to take some credit for Heidelberg?—Then I say nothing about it. Mr. Fitzpatrick called them 29,000 and 37,000. I have the same reason that you have; that those figures cover the whole population of Fitzroy and Collingwood.
2074. That service provided on both lines is the same as on the St. Kilda line, and the population would be about the same. You have ten-minute intervals there?—There is no ten minutes on the St. Kilda line.

2075. Fifteen to twenty minutes at off times. They must do it at ten-minute intervals, morning and evening, on the projected lines; they must have it; the people would look upon that as something in common with the other line. The point about the tramway is to be a ten-minute service, have you considered what railway accommodation will be required—something more surely than on those?

2076. You have the timetable?—Yes; but it has a population concentrated there. You will quote St. Kilda; but that is from that peculiar part, not all along the line. If you take Fitzroy or Johnston Street, the population is divided over every inch. The other point here is as to advantages derived from stations nearer Melbourne. With your permission, I would like to refer to two or three of the nearest in each case. If we take the Collingwood line, the first station is in Yarra Park opposite Sir William Clarke’s residence. I think it has been claimed that it will have an immense traffic from the cricket ground; if so, it is only right to point out that the present tramway is 100 yards away, whilst the cars go to within 100 yards of the ground; and at the present moment there is an effort being made to have them taken in right to the ground gates. If that road be constructed, so as to allow vehicles to put passengers down at the ground gates, there will not be many travel by the tram, because they would have to walk 400 yards, and then wait for a tram and a crush. Then take Highett Street, which is the next station on that line. That is right alongside the tramway line; the traffic from it would not be great, and there is not much reference to be made to it. On the Fitzroy line, the next station is in Lansdowne Street. I do not see where any traffic is to come from to the Lansdowne Street station, though it has been urged that people would go from the Public Office.

2077. What distance would it be from the Public Office?—I should say 400 yards from the Premier’s office. It is to be made in the gardens, and you only go into the gardens for the sake of getting the area.

2078. Do you argue that people will not go to a station in the gardens?—There is absolutely no traffic there at all.

2079. What about the traffic from the north to the Government Offices?—Having got the lines, they will have no further occasion to go to the Government Offices. That is all I have to say about Lansdowne Street. With regard to Gertrude Street, the chief traffic has been looked upon as the Exhibition traffic; if so, there again the people, in order to get into the heart of Melbourne, will have to walk over the Nicholson Street and two other trams.

2080. The Exhibition traffic is only part of it: why have you taken the Exhibition and not taken Gertrude Street itself?—I will come to that afterwards. The Exhibition traffic has been looked on as a great factor on account of the entertainments, but when I point out that passers-by have to cross three lines of tram, and then be dropped at Flinders Street instead of taking one of the trains, which are sent off as quickly as possible to where they could get a tram to the southern suburbs, I am afraid they would not patronize the trains. For the ordinary Gertrude Street traffic, if in question of frequency of traffic, and whether they will require two lines of tram, within 100 yards in the one case, and 100 feet in the other, to wait for an infrequent train. As for the Johnston Street station, that has within a reasonable distance four lines of trams. I mention this, because the Department apparently claim the population from three-quarter mile radius. If they do half that radius, there are four lines of tram going—the Nicholson Street, the Brunswick Street, the Smith Street, and the Johnston Street. The next point I wish to make slight reference to is the injury to the parks and reserves; and in regard to that, I simply mention it purely as a minor point, because there are cases where I have not the slightest doubt it is the proper thing to do to take a line through there in the interests of the colony rather than buy freehold land.

At the same time, there is no option in fixing the route, so that one would do less injury than another, all would agree, I think, in taking the one that would do the least injury.

2081. By the Hon. E. Morry.—How much would it take from the cricket ground, that is the route passed by the old Committee?—If it went down Hoddle Street and came in south?

2082. Yes—I do not know the route, but I should think it would do much less injury.

2083. The tram between the two cricket grounds?—I cannot express an opinion, because I do not know where it would go. The route proposed before came north of the Melbourne ground, and ran off between the Melbourne ground and Jolimont. With regard to the Fitzroy line, there would be a station in the Exhibition Gardens. The crossing the Treasury Gardens would be unavoidable, but to get into the Fitzroy Gardens is, I know, to be a question simply to get the area for a station. It appears to me that might well be let alone, as the station would be so little used, and in that case it would run up Lansdowne Street and not interfere with the gardens. In regard to the Collingwood line, I am not engineer, and I do not know how you are to present it; but many will regret spending the splendid reserve lying Wellington Parade.

2084. By the Chairman.—You could avoid by going nearer the back of the cricket ground?—I have no right to speak for the council with regard to anything that has not been before them; but anything that would go as against spoiling the park, I am sure they would approve of. I can only say, if the Committee have noticed that reserve in Wellington Parade within the last twelve months, it is something to be admired, and if this line is to go up the centre of it, it would utterly destroy it.

2085. Is that a greater destruction than going the line through the Fitzroy Gardens?—I suggest that there is so little benefit to be derived from the Lansdowne Street station, it would be well to take it right up the street, instead of going into the gardens at all.

2086. Why it is taken along the Wellington Parade is because it is less expensive?—I said the council considered that. It seems this is unavoidable.

2087. In a city or populous suburbs, you cannot take any line through a country, except at a great expense, unless by going through a broad street or through gardens of this kind. My own opinion is it would do much less harm than going through the park?—That is a question for the engineers, but I say so as little harm as possible.

2088. If there were only one line constructed, which line would you speak of?—If it is decided that the railway is to be constructed to the northern suburbs, and a better line than either of those cannot be submitted to your Committee, then the council would support the one that would have the least of the disadvantages which I have cited.
2099. Which is that—I From the points I have mentioned, certainly the Collingwood line. Certainly the disadvantage I have pointed out are less applicable to the Collingwood than the Fitzroy line. That is all we say about it.

2100. By the Hon. D. M'Intyre.—Supposing you just looked behind you at the sketch there. The Department in the evidence before us that we lose £25,000 a year in interest in carrying our traffic round that way: is it desirable to save that if we can?—Yes. We might possibly reduce our Income Tax then.

2101. That is the proposal of the Department—to attempt by these two railways to take the traffic, and thereby save the £25,000 a year; do you think it possible?—Possibly they may be able to save it at a less expense than by the two systems. That would be a great saving.

2102. Supposing we take one, and by time-table and money take two-thirds of the traffic, that is all that will help your council out the £25,000; will that not be an advantage?—Take the two-thirds where from?

2103. Two-thirds of the traffic by our new proposal instead of the old system?—Yes, would still have the old system.

2104. The Department say they lose £25,000 a year now.—That is in working expenses.

2105. Interest on the line and working expenses. They conceive the idea that they can take two-thirds of the trade in the area you have been discussing by shortening the distance to seven and nineteen minutes, that is two-thirds of the existing traffic between the tramways and trains.—Reeling Peter to pay Paul.

2106. Yes?—Then they may not see the advantage of it.

2107. I am speaking from the railway point of view. The proposal they make is to take the traffic, thereby saving in working expenses and interest, and, using their own words, they say in course of time to save the interest altogether.—Surely there is some slip in the premises. The loss is in running the existing line. By constructing the two other lines proposed, will you wipe out the loss on the other?

2108. By the Hon. Chairman.—You must understand they look in the population in the northern suburbs the number that they will have as Spencer-street as simply coming from them that they get no revenue from, and they believe the population in the northern area would travel as much as the people in the southern; and they make a calculation that they would put to many pounds in their pockets to make up the loss they have in running an empty train on Spencer-street. Then you mean by increased population?

2109. No, by going better facilities than to walk or drive to the city?—How do they get in now?

2110. Walk and drive?—I am afraid that is a weak foundation. It may be sound on an increase of population.

2111. We know the number of trips each person, each soul in the southern district, travels into Melbourne. There is a larger population in a given area in the north, and they do not travel more than one-half: where do they go?—Is it a travelling population?—I do not quite catch your point.

2112. If you are making a comparison between the income of one municipality against another municipality, do you net the rates and population?—The rates, without the population.

2113. There is a larger population in the northern than in the southern suburbs?—Is that so? I did not know.

2114. Yes, that is generally the comparison they give.—What do they call the northern suburbs? Tell me that, and then I will answer you. Shall we take Northcote and Fitzroy? The whole of my evidence has been adverse to the southern portion, that is, south of Junction-street; but if we take Fitzroy, its population is 27,000. From this return, Collingwood has 30,000, South Melbourne has 33,000, Princes has 36,000, Northcote has 6,000, and St. Kilda has 19,000. I fail to see where it comes in.

2115. You might as well go to Brighton and Caulfield?—Can you call Caulfield one of the northern suburbs?

2116. In South Melbourne and Albert Park people come in by two different lines and the railway; there are 33,000 of a population, and each person travels 16 times into Melbourne?—That is a return which I cannot check.

2117. Suppose that is correct; we have to take it the same as your version?—Yes.

2118. Taking Collingwood and the northern area, there are 68,000 persons, and they only travel 92 times.—Does that return show what proportion of that 68,000 is not affected by the railway?

2119. In the southern area some go 18 times.—How can the population of Collingwood which is lying east of Smith-street come into that return, and the population down by the river come into that return? I should say they come in by the present service, the Victoria-street teras, which takes them to their doors.

2120. Why does not the population come by the South Melbourne and Albert Park trains?—I do not know the facts. I think they do if they come to town.

2121. Do not a certain portion come by rail?—Yes.

2122. If they had the rail in the north, would not a further proportion come in by it?—No, because the difference is this: at South Melbourne the railway service and the South Melbourne tram service do not run parallel, as these lines propose to do. On the contrary, they are crossing at different points; and each can have an area of country of its own to supply, and has a monopoly of the traffic of that area; but here you have two lines which are going to run parallel, and therefore the premises are not by any means the same.

2123. You seem to be arguing from the same standpoint as the other gentlemen from the City Council did?—No.

2124. In the southern suburbs they have not more accommodation than they require, and they have trains and trains both, but in the north you say they have enough accommodation with only the trains?—No. Understand me, I do not say anything of the sort. I refer to nothing north of Junction-street. I say, as far as the northern suburbs are concerned, they are fairly entitled to, and should have, some means of getting off. Therefore, I leave those in the north out. We are simply dealing with the connecting links.

2125. By the Hon. D. M'Intyre.—When we were discussing the question of the train I wanted to point this out. On the last Committee taking evidence, we had Mr. Roddick and Mr. Fitzpatrick, and we
and Mr. Richard Spaight, who placed their views before us. Do you think they would be reliable witnesses? take Mr. Spaight first?—Oh, their own business they would be infinitely better witnesses than I would.

2116. If you look at question No. 257 in the present evidence it says—"Mr. Spaight thought the lines and stations had been put up at a cost of £100,000 a mile of revenue, based on the south suburban traffic."—Yes. Has the population increased or diminished much since 1890?—I think it is about the same; perhaps it is a little less than in 1890. I think you could count on a revenue of £10,000 now—that is, a revenue of £50,000 altogether from the two lines, 5 miles long." What do you think of that?—I should beg leave to hold a contrary opinion, taking the 1st mile from here.

2117. Those are three great men?—I will give in to the great men.

2118. We have 161 miles altogether of south suburban lines, and they bring in £300,000 a year; do you think that is a satisfactory result on 161 miles?—Heaven only knows. What does it take to produce it?

2119. If 161 miles bringing in £300,000 a year would you be frightened, if that is your income from the already constructed 161 miles, to face making the other 3 miles into such a territory as that is to serve?—I do not know what to say. If we get £300,000 a year from 164 miles of railway through a densely populated district—

2120. It is nowhere better than the 40,000 of Canningwood and Fitzroy. Do not put a weight on the densely populated?—I have already pointed out that the 161 miles from which you get the £300,000 a year is not constructed parallel to existing lines, but what you are proposing is to be, to a great extent, parallel. To that extent they differ.

2121. We do not want to go back to that?—But we have, because it reduces the production of the line.

2122. You agree that £300,000 a year is a fair income for 161 miles of railway?—I do not know.

2123. If we added another 5 miles, would you be inclined to speculate on one of the railways, from what you know?—No.

2124. The total income from the trams has been a handsome one all through. You know they have reduced the £1,650,000?—Yes; but you are forgetting that they pay no rent. What undertaking is there but has a rent to pay? That is simply their weekly rental; that seems to be lost sight of. The tramway is an out of getting fund and interest is simply a rent.

2125. They have reduced the amount by, or they have to the credit of the equitizing fund, a sum of £40,000?—Yes.

2126. And have been paying dividends ranging from 72 per cent. down to 5 per cent.?—I do not know about the 72 per cent. You know 72 per cent. was paid.—I say it should not be quoted as a facility at the question of this kind, because it was under circumstances that this policy was not, perhaps, see again.

2127. You know it was paid?—I do not know it. In this case, I do not happen to own any shares, and do not know what dividends they paid.

2128. Are you unaware of the history of the trams?—I am unaware that they paid 72 per cent. I do not hold stock in them.

2129. If it is sworn that there is no evidence?—Then it is true if it is there. I do not know anything about the dividends the Tramways Company have paid.

2130. You certainly gave figures as to what they were doing?—I did not quote any figures; I simply made statements which were correct.

2131. The figures are before me as to what the trams have been doing?—I did not give any figures.

2132. The trams have not made much?—I am able to work out a problem of that magnitude, but I cannot tell the profits. I do not know about the 72 per cent.

2133. I may say that was told me two days ago. The question I wanted to put is, is there anything from the history of both trams and railways discouraging in the history of the suburban trams and railways?

2134. The general opinion is that it is discouraging, but I am only giving newspaper talk.

2135. If they get an income of £300,000 a year from the 161 miles, tell us why we should not go on with the other lines?—If you are making a big profit on those figures, and can multiply that profit by extending your lines, by all means go on with them; that is from a material point of view.

2136. By Mr. Croker.—Do you know the scheme known as Millen's?—I have talked it over with him within the last few weeks.

2137. Could you give an idea as to the desirability of having a station at the Model Schools?—I would prefer not speaking on anything that was not before the council. The only question before them was the multiplicity of connecting lines.

Witness withdrawn.

Arthur Wells sworn and examined.

2138. By the Chairman.—What are you?—I am the Mayor of Lew, an architect by profession, and I reside at Lew. I have resided there for nineteen years, as long as I have been in the colony.

2139. Are you taking an interest in these north suburban lines?—As the representative of Lew I feel very interested in the subject. In the first place Lew has been very badly served with railway communication. The present railway is only on the outskirts of Lew, and is in a hollow. The northern and eastern portions can be practically considered to be without railway communication at all; and we think, if one of these lines is constructed it would open up the whole district. The present proposed route by Fairfield Park would not be so serviceable as the line mentioned some years ago through the asylum reserve. If that line were constructed it would put more than half Lew in direct communication with town.

2140. You think the Outer Circle, as constructed, would be suitable to a large portion of Lew?—Yes, to a large portion. There are three stations in Lew on the Outer Circle line, and taking the East Lew station as the first and in travelling, via Fairfield Park, the proposed northern suburban line, would be about 20 minutes. It takes now about one hour to reach town from that point. Notwithstanding, however, its present inaccessibility a great many have built in the neighborhood of these stations owing to the favorable situation, and worse facilities afforded for reaching town it will greater excess of population might be expected. As regards either line it is matter of indifference to
us, as they are two sides of a parallelogram. We are more interested in the future, when the line through the asylum grounds may be constructed. At present there is a population which would be served by the line, of roughly 1,000 people.

2141. Your interest is in asking us to give better facilities to a portion of the Kew people to get to Melbourne?—Yes, just so.

2142. Would they use the Outer Circle line if connected with the northern suburban?—Yes, I think they would; there is every chance of it.

2143. You have no opinion as to which line should be constructed, the Fitzroy or the Collingwood?—No, we have no preference in the matter, beyond which is the shortest. Should the line through the asylum grounds be constructed, it would hit the junction of the two lines near Clifton Hill.

2144. You were living at Kew when they were agitating for the Outer Circle line?—Yes.

2145. That was for the purpose of giving you better accommodation? I was not in the council then, and did not take much interest in it. I do not know what was put forward at that time.

2146. That line is no use to you at present?—None whatever.

2147. They are not running on it?—They never did travel by it.

2148. There was a motor running on that line?—Yes, a small train, consisting of a carriage and engine.

2149. Very few travel by it?—Yes.

2150. Can you give the reason of that?—Because of the length of time taken in travelling.

2151. You would have to come across to Alphington, and then to Collingwood, and go back to Spencer-street?—Yes; it was only used by a few persons wishing to cross the river.

2152. You do not know the population that is on the north-east side of the ridge?—The town clerk has calculated about 244 houses. Drawing a line midway between the present Kew station and the three stations on the Outer Circle line, there is a population of about 1,000 people; but beyond that again, just outside our boundary at Balwyn, there are a great many houses near the Deepdale station.

2153-4. By Mr. Harris.—What is the nearest station to the people at Balwyn?—Canterbury, I suppose.

2155. How far would that be from a fair average distance?—A mile and a half, possibly.

2156. By Mr. J. S. White.—Take the people from the junction of the White Horse-road and to the station you speak of; their interest would come to Camberwell?—Those about Deepdale station, I think, are within the township of Balwyn. If they could come round this way in about twenty minutes I think they would travel by the proposed route.

2157. The station is this side of the Survey Hotel, consequently it is some distance from Balwyn?

2158. I was not quite certain how far Balwyn extended.

2159. You calculate from the Kew station to the East Kew station?—No, I have drawn a line diagonally from the asylum gates to the Cotteran-road. On that side there are about 244 houses.

2160. Where would you strike the Cotteran-road, about the Burke-road?—About there.

2161. How is it the people did not patronize the train when it ran?—Because of the time it took one to get to town.

2162. Had they had any harmony among them there would have been a nearer way to run when that line was constructed, that is, the Outer Circle line?—I could not speak as to that, because I took no part in the railway agitation. I was under the impression that the Outer Circle line was made by the Government to take the heavy traffic from Gippsland.

2163. By the Chairman.—As a matter of fact it was to cross the foot of Rucker's Hill and to continue the Outer Circle line, not coming to Clifton Hill at all?—I do not know the particulars of the agitation at the time.

2164. By Mr. J. S. White.—That line was constructed, being part and parcel of the Outer Circle line, that was to bring in the heavy traffic from Oakleigh?—Yes.

2165. That was done for your especial benefit to Kew—for the passengers. When you were given a train with an engine and one carriage why did you not use it?—As I have said before, because of the length of time.

2166. By the Chairman.—You know really, as a matter of fact, that they had to run into Collingwood before they got back to Spencer-street?—Yes.

2167. That was a mile and a half more than it was intended to go?—Yes. We are relying upon, as I said before, a cut through the asylum grounds; then it would put that side of Kew within a shorter distance of Melbourne than at present.

2168. You say the line they laid out for the service of Kew is of no advantage?—No.

2169. Can you say how much value it would put on the asylum grounds if the line were constructed; what are they worth now?—I would not like to give an opinion. The land is of such a nature that you could not give an exact opinion as to how it would cut up for building purposes; same is suitable for building on and some is not.

2170. Have you any idea what it would fetch now?—About £50 an acre.

2171. And how much would it be worth if the Fitzroy line was constructed?—Do you mean with the line through the asylum reserve?

2172. What is it worth without the Fitzroy line?—We are valuing land thereabouts at from £60 to £80 an acre.

2173. Do you think it would be worth £80 an acre without the probability of the line, and with the probability of the Fitzroy line £120 of an advance?—It makes a great difference whether you cut up land for building, or whether it has to be used for purely agricultural purposes.

2174. With regard to the thousand people who would be served by the Collingwood line, how far are they from a station now?—Taking the mean of East Kew, that is about 1½ miles from the present Kew station.

2175. Have they any other conveniences for getting into town?—The tram, which is about three-quarters of a mile walk from East Kew. It takes about a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes to the terminus, and, owing to the hilly nature of our tram route, it takes about 40 minutes then. It takes about an hour altogether to get into town.
2175. Which way do they come?—They generally travel by tram, because it necessitates going up and down hill again to reach the present Kew terminus.

2176. By the Hon. E. Morely.—What time does it take to get to town by the tram?—Forty minutes from the terminus.

2177. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Would the proposed line improve it?—I think it should take about 25 minutes by Fairfield Park, pressuring it run right round without changing trains.

2178. By Mr. Concan.—The Collingwood line is the one you advocate?—We do not advocate any line particularly.

2179. Is it immaterial to you which you have?—Yes, we are more interested in the construction of the line through the asylum reserve, which we hope will eventually be constructed.

2180. You are interested in it inasmuch as you think if the line were made to Collingwood station at some future time, the straight cut would be made south of Fairfield Park?—Yes.

2181. Suppose either of those lines or a composite line were made, would the line by the Melbourne Cricket Ground be made out to here?—It would be impracticable, I think. There is no chance of its going through Kew on that side.

2182. If obstacles of that sort could be got over, would a line in that direction serve better than any other?—No. To open up the back part of Kew a line from Collingwood in an easterly direction to Willsmere would be the best, directly through the Yarra Bend and Kew Asylum grounds.

2183. By Mr. J. S. White.—You say that the land at the asylum at present is worth about £80 an acre?—Yes, probably it is.

2184. And if there were a railway it would be worth £500 an acre?—Yes.

2185. Over five times its present value?—Yes.

2186. As the line is to increase the value of your property five times,—the Government property.

2187. A. If it would increase the value of Government property it would increase the value of private property as well?—Yes.

2188. As you have a lot of people with property it would increase it to them?—Yes.

2189. Considering it is going to increase the value of property to private individuals, have you ever considered whether you were prepared to sustain a portion of the loss, if any, on the line?—That has not been put before the council.

2190. Have your council ever considered that?—No.

2191. You have only considered that it would be of advantage to you to have a line, and whether it would pay or not you have not considered?—No.

The witness withdraws.

Holland Loxton, sworn and examined.

2192. By the Chairman.—What are you?—Town Clerk of Kew.

2193. Will you just state what you have to say with respect to the proposed line either to Fitzroy or Collingwood?—This is a plan of Kew—producing the same. There is a red line drawn here which shows the division about the ridge, halfway between the Kew station and this side of the Outer Circle railway. It turns at the south-east corner of the Metropolitan Asylum, and runs to the junction of the Normanby-road with Cobham-road. To the north of that line the traffic would most likely go to a station on the Outer Circle railway, if there were any possibility of getting into town in a reasonable time. When the Outer Circle line was used, the time taken up was so great that after trying it for a time the people gave it up. They found they could get into town by better ways; but if the line were made through the asylum grounds from the Willsmere station to the Collingwood line it would shorten the distance and make it that the time taken up would be very much more than that by the Kew train from the Kew station.

2194. Then your council supports a northern suburban line—which do they support?—They do not care which.

2195. What is your estimate of the shortening of the distance to town?—I have not measured the distance, but I should think comparing the lines, it would be 25 minutes, say.

2196. At present it is what?—At present it takes fully an hour.

2197. You would save half-an-hour?—Yes.

2198. Indirectly you are interested in the shortening of this distance by way of Fitzroy or Collingwood?—Yes; it would open up a large tract of land for settlement which is now out of the way.

2199. Would it increase the value of the asylum ground?—Yes. As agricultural land it is worth from £60 to £80 per acre; and if there were a railway there to make it valuable for building on, it would be worth £2 a foot, which is about £500 an acre.

2200. To what extent is the State interested in it; they have a large acre, have they not?—Yes. The idea many years ago was to sell those asylum reserves, and they could not be sold. It would be utterly useless to try and sell them without a better means of communication to Melbourne at a moderate price; £2 a foot would be about £300 an acre for reasonable-sized allotments.

2201. How many acres have the State round there that they could spare?—I think about 400 acres.

2202. By Mr. J. S. White.—That would include what the buildings stand on?—Yes.

2203. By Mr. Harris.—Allowing for the buildings, and a fair margin of land round the buildings, how much would they have?—I could not say without looking into it.

2204. By the Chairman.—You think it would be worth about £600 an acre?—Yes.

2205. By Mr. Harris.—Allowing for the asylum buildings and a fair margin of land round those buildings, how much do you think could be sold?—Take the rear of the buildings towards Kew?—This plan has not any figures on it, and I cannot recollect; but I think it would give two-thirds of the land available for sale.
2206. By Mr. J. S. White.—Do they not cultivate a large portion of that for their own use at the asylum?—Yes, they cultivate the land which, you may suppose, to cultivate, is not worth more than $69 or $80 an acre.

2207. Do take the land they are now cultivating, and what balance is there left that they are not cultivating?—If the land were sold it would be necessary to remove the asylum.

2208. And that would cost money?—Yes.

2209. Do you think, the asylum being there, that land would fetch $500 an acre for building on?—No.

2210. Then the nuisance of the asylum, if a nuisance, must be removed first?—Yes.

The motion withdrawn.

George William Yeoman, sworn and examined.

2211. By the Hon. D. Moloney.—With regard to this proposed railway from Melbourne to Collingwood, and the other from Melbourne to Fitzroy, you are here to speak as to the Collingwood line?—Yes.

2212. Are you here to support the Collingwood line?—Yes.

2213. As it is now proposed?—Yes, our council is in favor of a railway being constructed to the northern suburbs and of the Collingwood line. It would be of great advantage to Richmond, and also to the Cifton Hill people. Speaking for Richmond, if you wish to get from there to Cifton Hill or Northcote it takes you an hour to Northcote, or three-quarters of an hour to Cifton Hill, at an expense of a dollar, and the distance is only about 24 miles. If the event of a railway being constructed Collingwood way it would be of benefit to Richmond people going in that direction I have mentioned, and also to people coming from the other way.

2214. By Mr. Harris.—What traffic would there be between those places?—I am not prepared to say how much.

2215. By the Chairman.—Will you go on with your statement?—I do not know that I have anything more to say about it.

2216. What proportion of Richmond would be benefited by that line?—I think all Richmond.

2217. Would any portion of the city use it to go to Melbourne?—Yes, part of Bridge-road.

2218. Approximately, what number of people in Richmond would feel the influence of that railway?—Five thousand or 8000; there are about 35,000 of a population altogether.

2219. Do you think it would be a paying traffic to the State, that Richmond proportion; would it give sufficient traffic to be its share in the paying?—I am not prepared to say.

2220. Do you think your council would step in to guarantee. Of course, you are aware that the law as it stands at the present time no one is interested, or the various municipalities interested, will have to guarantee the interest on the compensation for the purpose of lands required. Would your council stand their proportion constructively?—I do not think so.

I only speak for myself. I have not been asked to speak of it.

2221. If the Department placed you within their influence?—I cannot say; it is a point that wants discussing.

2222. By the Hon. E. Morey.—Are you a councillor of Richmond?—Yes.

2223. Where does the line yet favour start from,—between the Richmond Cricket Ground and the Melbourne Cricket Ground?—I think the station should be near High-street.

2224. You would be in favour of a line going round and taking the traffic from the cricket grounds in holiday times?—I thought you meant whether the people of Richmond would take the train from Melbourne.

2225. There are different routes submitted?—I think we would be in favour of a route through Yarra Park near the Melbourne Cricket Ground, on the north-west side of it.

2226. Do you think it would be any benefit, at the time of any extraordinary gatherings at the cricket ground, to bring people from the other suburbs to a station there?—Yes.

2227. Do you think it would be practicable, not only for bringing them to Melbourne, but taking passengers to Kew and other places?—Yes.

2228. You think your council will be in favour of a line that way?—Yes.

2229. By Mr. Craven.—I suppose you mean a line tapping the southern portion of the cricket ground, with a platform there?—Would it be on the south side of the cricket ground?—Yes. You see by the plan the present one goes here—[pointing to the plan]—from the Richmond station. The Government proposes a line along Willingdon-parade. Mr. Morey's idea is to go to the south of the cricket ground, have a station there, and land the passengers on the cricket ground?—I think that would be best.

2230. Follow the present Richmond line from Melbourne until near the cricket ground, and then go up High-street?—I think that would be the best.

2231. By the Hon. Morey.—That spot seems to be a great gathering-ground for space, and they are spending great sums of money there to provide additional accommodation?—Yes, and a station there would bring the people from every where by all, and from the south especially.

2232. By Mr. J. S. White.—Have your council ever considered the route at all. Being the representatives of a large rateable portion of the people interested in the matter, have they looked at the route as a council?—Yes, and they looked on it that the Collingwood line—

2233. From where it joins the Richmond line where it comes into Melbourne. You said you thought the best route would be through Yarra Park; if so, why has not your council argued for that?—They have not gone into that.

2234. Being close to Melbourne with a population of 30,000?—That route is now to be; it has only just been pointed out to us.

2235. Have your council passed any resolution on this matter?—Yes.

2236. And they say and plans before them?—I suppose so. Perhaps the surveyor could speak better on that than I.
2328. As it has been put to you by Mr. Money, do you think it would not pay the State least, and suit you best, if the line were south of the Melbourne Cricket Ground, and also near your cricket ground, and that came up near the engine-sheds on one where the trains would be? That would be a good way, would it not?—That is a good way from a station.

2329. From where the line leaves Flinders-street, suppose you put another line down until you get to the south of the Melbourne Cricket Ground, and then go through the line to Elizabeth-street, that would suit the Melbourne Cricket Ground and your cricket ground too, would it not?—Yes.

2330. Do you think that would not pay the least for the public and serve you as well?—Yes, I think so.

2331. You said just now that it was very inconvenient to go from Richmond to Clifton Hill and Northcote; how often do you go there yourself?—Perhaps once a fortnight.

2332. Can you tell us any one else who goes there?—No.

2333. You cannot tell me the revenue to be derived from there?—No, but I know it has been spoken of by the public. I think there was one time when a cab was substituted to run there, so that shows there is a desire for communication.

2334. This line goes through your territory, through the North ward.—The east of the North ward.

2335. The west side of the North ward?—Yes.

2336. If it goes through there, under the Act, the council or the municipality have to find the hand and enter into an agreement to pay for the interest on the purchase on the ground, which may by £2,000 a year; that is from Victoria-street to Bridge-rom; have you considered that that part of the question?—Yes.

2337. Do you think if it were brought before the council, and they knew they would have to do that, would they support the line?—I would not like to say on my own responsibility; it has never been considered.

2338. By Mr. Creer.—Do you know the Railway Lands Acquisition Act, about the districts through which a line passes being made liable for interest?—No.

2339. I may tell you that any district through which a line passes would have to guarantee the interest on the money for which the land is purchased?—That has not been considered by us.

2340. The witness withdrew.

Charles James Jago, sworn and examined.

2350. By the Hon. D. Neilson.—Are you a member of the Richmond Council?—Yes.

2351. You have been appointed by the council to give evidence on these proposed Collingwood and Fitzroy lines?—Yes, that is correct.

2352. Are you here in support of a line?—I am here in support of the Collingwood line; that is the only one I have given consideration to.

2353. Will you kindly state the various points that you think would be of advantage to your municipality, in connection with the Collingwood line?—It would be a convenience more, I think, to people outside Richmond than to those in it.

2354. By Mr. Harris.—What people outside Richmond?—Take them beyond Clifton Hill, more correctly, as far as you like to go; it would then make a connecting link with a large district, which I suppose has not the convenience of a direct railway at present; that is, in Heidelberg. Of course, it is not so much the present we look at, but the future; and to look to the future it would be advisable to make the best possible bargain you can with the municipalities and carry the line which would be to the best advantage in time to come. I traced the point the other day by going to Heidelberg. I happened to be in Simpson-street, and I jumped on the tram and went to Spencer-street, got into the train, and in about three-quarters of an hour I found myself back again in Johnston-street; and eventually got to Alphington. It took me half-a-day to do that, and I would walk it in one-third of the time; and I did not get to Heidelberg at all.

2355. Do you think it would be a paying traffic on that line?—I think there is no doubt. I remember a time when, by the North-Eastern line now, one coach a day left the Albert Hotel and carried all the passengers; but that line was not opened a month before they wanted three trains a day. If you give people the facilities they will travel; but if you make it difficult to get to a station they will stay at home.

2356. You think the Collingwood line would be a commercial one?—Yes; not at the present, but in the future. The fact is it would be a material loss to Richmond if the line were constructed, for we would lose something like £1,400 a year in rates.

2357. By Mr. Harris.—Do you mean that the people will leave their properties?—No, from the properties that will be wiped out.

2358. By the Chairman.—Is there any other point you wish to mention?—That line would be a general connecting link between all the places beyond Clifton Hill and the metropolis. As to running the train into the city, I would take it as the southern side of the cricket ground, and have a station there. That would connect all the other lines with the incoming ones.

2359. By Mr. J. S. White.—That is from Brighton?—Yes, and everywhere. Now, people have to go to the Richmond station on Saturdays when anything special is being done on the cricket ground, and you can scarcely get up the steps for the crowd. It would be a decided benefit to connect the lines with one platform at the cricket ground. Years ago there was a platform there, but it was wiped out; it was not then thought that the cricket ground would come to what it is now. It was a minor thing then, and see what it has come to.

2360. By Mr. Creer.—Seeing there is so much traffic to the cricket ground, do you know why the railway authorities have not catered for it?—They were never asked to. The platform laid there for years; but when the improvements were made at the Richmond station it was thought they would be sufficient for all purposes.

2361. Assuming that the Collingwood routes were carried out, where would you suggest would be the proper positions for stations to suit the residents about Richmond?—I should imagine you would require from Johnston-street to Wellington-parade two stations, and one at the parade.
2262. It is proposed to have one at the crossing of the parades, and one at Highgate-street; would they be in satisfactory positions?—I think it would every three.

2263. That is, one near Collingwood—(explaining on the plan). You would suggest a station just inside the park and another near Victoria-parade, and another between that and Collingwood?—Yes.

2264. By the Hon. D. Melville,—You think that any station you would get five people out of 10,000 that would go to the East Melbourne station, but you would get them beyond. The people there can afford to pay 5d. better perhaps, than I can a farthing, and they would get into the trains.

2265. By Mr. Corun.—Is there a dense population between the Victoria-parade and Burnley?—Yes, but Burnley is a long way out of the way.

2266. There is a big extent of country, taking the main line—East Richmond, Burnley, and so on, on the south, on the Hawthorn line—There is a big population.

2267. Is there a big population there which will not be served by a line eastly, even by the Collingwood line?—I would not like to answer that. They seemed to have served now by the trains, but I think the connecting link with the Johnston-street terminus would be independent of the trains. It was originally intended that they should come round near Hawthorn, but that would have made it further.

2268. Would any intermediate line, striking out from Victoria-parade almost in a direct line to Victoria-street bridge, accommodate a large number of people?—I would certainly, more than it might in this instance, but then the deviation would be so wide; you would have to go out and come in again.

2269. I mean a separate line altogether?—I cannot say anything about that.

2270. By Mr. J. N. White.—As an old councillor, I suppose you have considered the responsibility of the council in this matter?—No; we considered the loss, but not the responsibility.

2271. Would you take the responsibility of guaranteeing to pay the interest on £20,000?—No.

2272. Would the property to be taken down be likely to be worth £20,000 in your district?—When the line gets out at Bridgeville the property will be purchased by the State, and you have to guarantee the interest on that money?—Individually I should say no.

2273. By Mr. Harris.—Has the matter been discussed by your council?—No. In fact we were never consulted with the conditions of constructing a line on those terms. I know we should have about £210 to £210.10 per year in loss of rate. But I do not think the Government would ask for that guarantee.

2274. By the Hon. D. Melville.—That is the law; it is as a guarantee of good faith?—I am certainly of opinion that the line would not pay at present up to what the people expect; but I am certain that the near figure it would pay.

2275. By Mr. J. S. White.—And be an advantage to people in the neighbourhood?—Yes.

2276. By Mr. Harris.—What is the objection to the Fizzroy line?—I have not considered it.

2277. You favour the Collingwood line?—We are more interested in that.

2278. Suppose the Fizzroy line were constructed and not the Collingwood?—I do not think we should try it over.

2279. Would it be any benefit to you?—Not the slightest; it is too far away I think. According to the figures I have read in the papers, it is a very fair thing that this line would give something like £900 or £700 a year profit. That is a very good thing in hard times. I do not think it would pay in the ordinary way of business. A man investing the total amount required would expect to make more than £600 or £700 a year.

2280. By Mr. J. S. White.—First you said it would not pay for the first few years?—Not pay well.

2281. Then you say there would be £600 or £700 a year profit; that means to pay everything and leave that profit?—Yes, but I mean paying well as a commercial transaction. A profit of £600 or £700 a year on two hundred and odd thousand pounds would not be paying well.

The witness withdrew.

George Leuty, sworn and examined.

2282. By the Hon. D. Melville.—You have come to support the Collingwood line on behalf of the Richmond Council?—Yes.

2283. You have heard the two previous witnesses state certain facts in support of the line; do you agree with them?—Yes, a little more than agree. Councillor Freeman was a little off in numbers. I agree in the main, but I have a little something new to add. Of those who are travelling citywards, it will accommodate 10,000 people, without those travelling in a northerly direction. Of course, they will not go to Numurkah, but it will accommodate fully 40,000 people, so that all they have said, with the exception of those numbers, I could endorse. There is one thing that has been left out by every speaker. We have a very large number of bakers and maltsters, and a line if going in a northerly direction towards Heidelberg and up on the Yarra Flats, it is well known, will get into the very best beds in Victoria for growing barley. That is a fact, and I, as an old farmer, have known that for years. If the line is constructed, it will take the produce from those fields right to the very doors of our breweries and malt-houses. We have reason to believe, if the line is constructed, in a year or two, these people will cultivate barley to a very great extent, and it will be of very great advantage in employing people in our breweries and maltings, of which we have a large number. We have considered that if was done it would be one of the greatest growth industries in that district, and it very important one. I would say, as far as people travelling northwards are concerned, I have every reason to believe that, when they have a chance to do it, where ten would be travelling northwards now, perhaps 100 or 200 would be travelling northwards when they had the facilities. I must agree with Councillor Jago that it is a very slow route at present, as you either have to walk or take a special cab, or if you want to come to town, it is at the cost of both time and money.

2284. You think there would be a fair development of traffic?—Yes. I think it is one which with a little cultivation and given a little time would become one of the best paying lines in the neighbourhood.

2285. You have no doubt as to that?—Not the slightest.

2286. How long have you been in Richmond?—I have been living there ten years.

Northern Session.
2297. Your council, as a body, are quite in favour of the Collingwood line?—Quite.
2298. This question of the guarantee you have not considered?—Not specially.
2299. You do not think it will be required?—No.
2300. What I mean is that it would ultimately net come on you; that, though you would be liable, you don't think the line would be a payable one?—Yes; if we thought it would be a drain on our pockets, we would not be in favour of it; but we are so much afraid of success that we did not look on the other side.
2301. In addition to fertile lands and fruit in the district, collaterally there would be a good traffic to your district?—A very great goods traffic, we believe.
2302. By Mr. J. S. H. (e)—You have a good large station at Richmond East?—Yes, but that is a long way from where we are speaking of. If there are goods there will certainly be a station to receive them.
2303. Are there not plenty of goods coming down the North-Eastern line that you would be glad to have?—Those are not the goods we anticipate.
2304. There is no goods station to be between the Collingwood station and Melbourne?—Not unless wanted.
2305. It is not a line for a goods traffic; it is a suburban line?—At Johnston-street you could receive goods, and that would be a great help.
2306. Can you go there now?—We could stimulate our industries.
2307. You said you had a thousand people travelling now?—From the east of the North ward.
2308. Does not the North ward go down to the river?—No, to Burnley-street.
2309. The Burnley-street goods would come from Burnley-street to the Highton station, and then come from the railway to come to Melbourne?—Yes; those in the north-east part of the North ward are sure to come.
2310. The North ward has only about 8,000 persons in it altogether?—Yes, but there is the West ward, too.
2311. I know some will use it, of course?—Yes.
2312. Surely you are not trying to make your Committee believe that they will come from Burnley-street to Highton-street in order to come to Melbourne?—Plenty of them will.
2313. By the Hon. E. N. (e)—What time would you have coming by this line instead of coming by the other way?—I am not prepared to say, as I do not know what rate it will travel at. We take now, to come in from Burnley-street, 35 minutes to the Town Hall, about that. I think latterly the trains are going a little faster.
2314. You think all the western portion of Richmond will travel by this line if made?—Not the whole population, but a great number of them.
2315. They will not be like many others; after advocating the line, if the trains came down a sanny they would all take to the trains?—The world wide, where they can get it cheapest there they will go.
2316. According to your idea, as this is such a great district away to the north, you think there should be a station for taking the goods into the western portion of Richmond?—I think so.
2317. And you think there would be a good market for those goods in Richmond?—Yes, because we have a number of multhouses and breweries.
2318. And you use a great amount of fruit?—Yes, as an ordinary population.
2319. You think it would be absurd to take all your goods round that circle when you can come this other way?—Yes; I think the time will come when the one nearest Highton-street will be a goods station.
2320. Your council advocate it as being the best line for Richmond, and you will reap a great benefit?—Yes.
2321. That is not your object?—Yes; the population is the great thing, but that is one of the objects.
2322. By Mr. Coven.—Is there much passenger traffic at Burnley station?—I am not prepared to say, this is a good distance from where we are speaking of.
2323. According to the map, the people there would have nearer to go by Burnley-street station than any station on the Collingwood route?—No, not the North ward.
2324. For instance, the people at Bridge-road and Burnley-street, where would they go?—Most likely to Burnley-street station at present.
2325. The people following Burnley-street along north, half-way between Bridge-road and Victoria-street, where would they go?—I should imagine they would come to the Highton-street station.
2326. As a matter of fact, it would be one-fourth of the distance longer to go to the Collingwood line than to Burnley-street?—Probably it would be less money.
2327. If a great number of people would go to the Collingwood line, that would affect the present line?—Only to a very small extent. What accommodation would be given to those in the west—that is the question?
2328. By the Chairman.—I understand you say you are in favour of the Collingwood line?—Yes.
2329. That is entirely owing to the population in Collingwood itself and that portion of Richmond you suppose it would accommodate?—It would accommodate a large population in Collingwood as well as Richmond and Jalmaunt. The whole of West Richmond and Jalmaunt will be accommodated.
2330. Are you taking anything beyond Collingwood?—Between Victoria-street and Johnston-street?
2331. I have spoken up Heidelberg way. Do you know the country?—Yes, I do, well.
2332. Do you expect any support from that part—Ethills and Diamond Creek?—I naturally suppose they will come in from that way when they have the facilities.
2333. I suppose you have come to some conclusions as to the feeding ground of this railway?—Yes.
2334. Have you any idea of the amount of goods delivered towards Johnston-street, Clifton Hill, and Northcote?—I have not made inquiries as to that.
2335. How do you reckon they are entitled to goods station accommodation?—Because it is such a large area and so thickly populated. I do not know of any part so thickly populated without accommodation.
2326. Are they using the stations, commencing at Heidelberg, Ivanhoe, Alphington, Fairfield, Clifton Hill and Collingwood? Are they using those stations for goods?—There is a goods deal is being brought into Johnston-street. There is coal and grain being brought to the mills, but beyond that I am not prepared to say, although I often go over that part, what goods are being brought there.

2327. The contention is amongst the town people that this line would not be utilized for goods at all, that it is merely a passenger line?—I do not agree with that part of it. I have reason to believe that goods will undoubtedly, when that line is established, be brought there, perhaps in five times the quantities that are brought at present.

2328. Do you know how many tons are delivered at Collingwood?—I never made inquiries, but that can be got very easily from the Department.

2329. We have got it, but it is asked for the purpose of trying the faith of people who give evidence?—But we give evidence that it will assist our city.

2330. There were 24,119 tons of goods delivered at Collingwood, and freight paid £12,060 odd. The total tonnage 35,000 tons, and freight £15,682 odd on the stations. You people come here?—We had every reason to suppose you had all these figures before you and it would be only repetition for us to bring them.

2331. We want to try the local people to see what grounds they have for advocating a line or opposing it?—More particularly to-day, when I went to our office to get the figures, I was told they were all before you, and I need not get them.

2332. By Mr. Creame.—There was some evidence given by Mr. Fitzpatrick at question 653 as follows:—"Your opinion is that we should altogether depend on the suburban passenger traffic, and nothing else?—That is all. You would ask the Committee to discard any calculation or any influence as to goods?—As traffic management, I have not made any allowance for goods, and I do not think any allowance should be made?—That would make our case somewhat better.

2333. How far do you agree with that?—The case would be far better than he is anticipating.

2334. Who is in favour of is only on what he is reckoning. We can reckon on something far more.

2335. When he states that it is not the intention to have any stations with accommodation for goods, is he right?—No.

2336. And you think that if such a line is constructed, and no provision for goods traffic is made, a great mistake will be made you think?—Yes.

The witnesses withdraw.

John Shanks Jenkins, sworn and examined.

2336. By the Chairman.—What are you?—A civil engineer. I live at Richmond, and have been there about twenty years.

2337. You know the country to be served by the proposed lines?—Yes, all the metropolitan area for the last 40 years.

2338. You know the districts that the southern suburbs are in?—Yes. I gave evidence before the Committee on the last occasion when they took evidence.

2339. Have you altered your opinions since then?—No; I am still of opinion that the line by Wellington-parade to Collingwood is the correct one, and also one through the Fitzroy Gardens going to Fitzroy.

2340. The Fitzroy line would be no use at the end without the Collingwood line?—No.

2341. Consequently, if there is only one line constructed, you prefer the Collingwood?—Yes.

2342. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Have you any points to urge beyond what the other witnesses have said?—I do not know what they said. If there is one point, knowing the trainway system, my mind is inclined with line. Starting at Wellington-parade, you would tap the railway trainway line, the Victoria-street line, and also the Johnston-street line. You would then go on from Johnston-street to Clifton Hill, connect that line, and connect with the St. George's road further on. The Collingwood line cuts all those tram lines at right angles. The great trouble in the present tram system is that you can get from one line to another you have to come right into the city and go out again, or else walk. This line would be of great service in making what I call a spider's web. The Fitzroy line would not supply that want readily so well, because it is too near the city. This one, being further out, suits it very much better.

2343. By Mr. J. S. White.—You, of course, know the districts that you have been engineer for; that is, Richmond?—Yes.

2344. You know Yarram Park very well?—Yes.

2345. Do you think a better line could be got by continuing the line towards Richmond until you got south of the Melbourne Cricket Ground, and then working your way up to Highett-street, than cutting up the parade?—No, because it is a quarter of a mile longer, and I cannot see why an every-day passenger should be taken round that quarter of a mile every train for the sake of taking passengers once a week or once a month to the Melbourne Cricket Ground. If the Railway Department want to serve the cricket ground they could do it by putting in a siding from the existing lines.

2346. You know there is a station proposed at the parade; do you think many would use that station?—A great many use the trains at present.

2347. Do you think they would use the trains and be landed in Flinders-street?—Yes; season ticket holders would. On a hot day I would rather pay 5d. than walk.

2348. Do you not think there would be a great revenue got from the park; they have laid out a large amount of money there, and are laying out a road, and would not you have an easier grade that way?—Yes; but the Railway Department could have a platform there without building this line.

2349. They would have to put in another line?—In your line you would too require to have a siding for the special trains running to the cricket ground. The ordinary trains for Heidelberg could not afford the whole accommodation any more that the Caulfield ordinary trains could accommodate the racing traffic there.

2350. The ordinary trains could not take them?—No.
2351. But the same line would take them?—Yes. But all you want to do that now is to make a siding off the present line running to Richmond. In one case you are within a stone’s throw, and in the other some little distance away.

2352. By the Hon. E. Marget—Why should you take the people in to Flinders Street and take them back again?—I am not advocating that. If the traffic would pay, platforms could be made on the Brighton line also, opposite the cricket ground.

2353. Would no one from your suburbs come in to the cricket ground?—A great many come from that neighbourhood.

2354. What is your population?—About 35,000. It would be no much more distance to come into Melbourne on the short line and come back than the Collingwood line round by the cricket ground. Say a passenger from Hawthorn; he could not stop on the siding coming from Collingwood.

2355. Why should a man pay to go to Melbourne and back again to the siding when you can drop him on the road?—If you expect large traffic from Collingwood, then your argument is good. I do not see why a line should be made for them to the cricket ground.

2356. Has not Collingwood a very large population?—Yes.

2357. Would it not suit the people beyond Collingwood as the settlement goes on?—Yes.

2358. When you are making the line why not make it to oblige all the districts; it is only a quarter of a mile count.—That means an extra expense in making and working.

2359. It means less, because the ground is level at the cricket ground?—So is Wellington-parade, by which route you satisfy the trustees of the park.

2360. You are going to destroy all that beautiful parade, when you have a route, only a quarter of a mile longer, that would avoid it.—That is a matter for the engineers to consider. I say the Wellington-parade is the proper line and I am not advocating that to the first Committee.

2361. By the Hon. D. Melville.—You Richmond people are not afraid of any injury arising to the tram.—No. We have not considered the matter, but I think the trams can take care of themselves.

2362. Do you think the railway would be a developing agency so both trams and trains?—I think so.

2363. Do you think the railway and trams running in this district will benefit each other?—Yes, because it will make a connecting link as I said.

2364. And both will take more money?—Yes.

2365. And the one help the other?—Yes.

2366. By Mr. Harris.—That the trams will take more money than at present?—Not at present, but the population is bound to increase.

2367. Allowing for the idea that the population will increase, will the trams be as well off as at present?—No. You see they have the Collingwood traffic all to themselves now.

2368. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Ultimately they will be better off?—Yes.

2369. Within a few years?—Yes. As a councillor, having some interest in the ultimate end of the tramways, I see no objection to making the lines.

2370. By Mr. J. S. White.—When will the population increase?—It will increase naturally.

2371. Has it done so within the last twelve months. No doubt there will be an increase of the young, but are the bread-winners increasing?—We are in a very peculiar time now.

2372. There being a very peculiar state of affairs just now, it is advisable to lay out any more money at present?—We must not cry stabbing fish. This is the New York of Australia, and we should not be afraid of the future of the place. And we can buy land cheaper now.

2373. By Mr. Harris.—What do you think of this statement in the précis of the Report of the first Railways Standing Committee as these lines:—"The Government Statist estimated at that the end of 1890 the population of the Northern Suburbs would be 121,000"?—I think that is just as good a forecast as that given by him to the Metropolitan Board of Works as to the future growth of Greater Melbourne.

The witness withdrawn.

Alfred Clayton, sworn and examined.

2374. By the Chairman.—What are you?—Town clerk and city surveyor of Richmond.

2375. You have been present during the time the other gentlemen from Richmond have been giving evidence, have you anything fresh to say?—They have stated all the facts, I think.

2376. Do you agree with what they have said?—Yes, I do. I think there is no doubt the Collingwood line would be of advantage to Richmond; the Fitzroy line would be no advantage to Richmond.

2377. By Mr. Harris.—Why?—Because it is too far off. The Collingwood line, as has been explained, cuts all the trams at right angles, and it would afford facilities for using them. I do not agree with Councillor Jenkins about the line Wellington-parade. I believe in the line at the cricket ground; it would be a source of revenue. As to the goods stations, goods could be carried along the line at night: but, of course, with the passenger traffic the passengers shift themselves, and it is cheaper to work than the other. On holidays, when there is anything on at the Melbourne Cricket Ground or the Richmond Cricket Ground, the Richmond station is crowded to a terrible extent. I think if they put a station on the Wellington-parade line they would foreclose the tram to take the train, because it is easier to get into a tram than to encounter all the rumpus and so on. As to the traffic returns, I think the statistics for estimating the same are not always constant and reliable. I could give you any number of estimates of traffic, showing where the estimates of traffic are out.

2378. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Money that they said they made?—On the Isle of Man railway a large revenue was expected for carrying hirings, and they do not carry a pennyworth.

2379. They got traffic from a new source?—Yes. A little while ago, and not long ago, in one place I know only one line of buses could get a living, and now they have two lines of trams. As the Crystal Palace at home the Chatham and Dover Railway Company have made a line right into it; and if you had a convenient line to the cricket ground here there could be no doubt there would be a great revenue derived from it. They are increasing the grand stand accommodation there, and every year new attractions will be added. On the Fitzroy line there is nothing of that kind.
2380. Your experience was, in England and elsewhere, that the railways and trams help each other?—Yes; the more accommodation you give the better. The trams were started in 1886, and a number of cars took in a certain number of passengers, but now there must be ten times the traffic.
2381. You have heard that the councillors of the city of Melbourne cannot sleep night or day from thinking of the terrible loss they are to have in twenty years' time; have you heard of that?—I have not heard of it.
2382. They have appeared here to state that a terrible calamity will overtake us when the trams fall in; do you think that?—No, because they would let again, and probably the same people would take them. In the traffic the tram is somewhat different from other things. They generally get the largest traffic at the start. The railways go longer distances and there are fewer stoppages. I think you will find the local traffic increased more than the other.
2383. By the Chairman.—Suppose there were no line constructed to the northern suburbs, do you think in the course of a year or two the trams would have to increase their lines to them?—There was a Bill got some time ago for taking a tramway along Punt-road and Hoddle-street. I think, possibly, if the times had remained as they were we would have seen that made; but at the present stage I do not think we shall see it.
2384. They wanted to continue their tram along Hoddle-street down for 7 or 8 miles; they were not afraid of the railway?—No.
2385. By the Hon. E. Morey.—You think the population of Richmond, and also Collingwood, is quite sufficient to guarantee that a line should be made for them?—I think there would be a considerable amount of traffic.
2386. You think a greater number would travel by that line?—There would be a considerable portion, because, if you made a line to go there, many people would go to live there who wanted to come into town daily, and who do not live there at present. Many people along the proposed line now are workpeople and manufacturers. When you come on the top of the hill and along Hoddle-street, those people would come in regularly by the train.
2387. By Mr. Harris.—With regard to some particulars contained in a document furnished by the Railway Department, will you look at that—[handing a document to the witness]. That is information that is furnished with regard to the traffic to be derived from the line. Are you able to grapple with those figures given there; what do you think of them?—I do not understand anything about them, and cannot give any evidence about them.

The witness withdrew.

**Adjoined to Wednesday, 4th November, at eleven o'clock.**

**WEDNESDAY, 4TH NOVEMBER, 1896.**

**Members present:**

Mr. Cameron, in the Chair;

Mr. Burton,
Mr. Craven,
Mr. Harris,
Mr. J. S. White.

John McMahon, further examined.

The Witness.—I wish to hand in a paper showing the earnings of the various suburban lines.

2388. Is the paper prepared from any official papers?—From the Report of the Victorian Railways Commissioner for the year ending 30th June, 1896. I put this in as portion of my evidence, showing the traffic to and from the stations on the undermentioned lines.—[The witness handed in the following statement.—]

**Northern Suburbs Existing Lines.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Passengers Outwards only</th>
<th>Passengers In and Out</th>
<th>Passengers and Passengers combined</th>
<th>Goods In and Out</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Fitzroy</td>
<td>24,4207</td>
<td>1,763</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>2,369</td>
<td>5,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy</td>
<td>21,212</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carlton</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>4,348</td>
<td>10,349</td>
<td>8,339</td>
<td>17,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Station (see page 144)</td>
<td>952,349</td>
<td>6,784</td>
<td>2,616</td>
<td>3,394</td>
<td>24,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittles Section (see page 144)</td>
<td>14,004</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>4,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Melbourne to Royal Park</td>
<td>966,557</td>
<td>7,840</td>
<td>3,945</td>
<td>11,785</td>
<td>26,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Brunswick to Coburg</td>
<td>290,049</td>
<td>1,285</td>
<td>3,287</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>2,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood</td>
<td>966,757</td>
<td>5,292</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>12,203</td>
<td>17,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Hill</td>
<td>274,785</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>5,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>2,462,866</td>
<td>19,104</td>
<td>6,501</td>
<td>26,005</td>
<td>52,660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87,865
### Preston Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Passengers and Parcels combined</th>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>No. 104,769</td>
<td>£673</td>
<td>£90</td>
<td>£736</td>
<td>£763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Northern</td>
<td>110,867</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>3,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croxton</td>
<td>90,643</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>2,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorley</td>
<td>27,842</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston (Bell-street)</td>
<td>112,287</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>4,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston (Murray-street)</td>
<td>67,679</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston (Regent-street)</td>
<td>112,015</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir</td>
<td>14,288</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>622,820</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,348</strong></td>
<td><strong>802</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,140</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,639</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Whittles Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Passengers and Parcels combined</th>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>opping</td>
<td>No. 2,296</td>
<td>£93</td>
<td>£188</td>
<td>£281</td>
<td>£182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themstown</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Morang</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yan Yaan</td>
<td>5,319</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan Yaan</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittles</td>
<td>4,494</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,508</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,056</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,333</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,391</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,671</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### North Melbourne to Royal Park Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Passengers and Parcels combined</th>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mastenby-end</td>
<td>No. 127,075</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemington-bridge</td>
<td>115,326</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Park</td>
<td>49,648</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>290,049</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,925</strong></td>
<td><strong>342</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,907</strong></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### South Brunswick to Coburg Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
<th>Passengers and Parcels combined</th>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Brunswick</td>
<td>No. 102,094</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>6,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunswick</td>
<td>135,088</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>2,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morning</td>
<td>108,784</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>2,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburg</td>
<td>204,963</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2,059</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>673,926</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,004</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,265</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,269</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,293</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Heidelberg Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northcote South</td>
<td>14,017</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>11,669</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphington</td>
<td>30,391</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanhoe</td>
<td>36,450</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg</td>
<td>82,231</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>274,788</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### South Melbourne Lines

#### St. Kilda Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Melbourne</td>
<td>904,969</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Park</td>
<td>1,291,530</td>
<td>8,870</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Park</td>
<td>430,281</td>
<td>3,185</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Kilda</td>
<td>869,203</td>
<td>7,454</td>
<td>4,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,102,014</td>
<td>23,089</td>
<td>5,403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Camberwell Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Richmond</td>
<td>690,092</td>
<td>4,508</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentinck</td>
<td>365,101</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>8,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
<td>977,392</td>
<td>8,365</td>
<td>1,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenferrie</td>
<td>1,885,882</td>
<td>11,827</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>1,065,115</td>
<td>11,464</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camberwell</td>
<td>961,738</td>
<td>12,285</td>
<td>3,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,132,863</td>
<td>52,230</td>
<td>16,088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Brighton Line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
<th>Goods</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1,533,110</td>
<td>14,565</td>
<td>1,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Yarra</td>
<td>1,262,923</td>
<td>14,304</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panorama</td>
<td>889,768</td>
<td>8,171</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>883,755</td>
<td>8,968</td>
<td>3,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balckzana</td>
<td>999,998</td>
<td>6,170</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsternwick</td>
<td>797,125</td>
<td>9,864</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Brighton</td>
<td>533,808</td>
<td>8,306</td>
<td>1,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Brighton</td>
<td>475,021</td>
<td>7,169</td>
<td>1,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Beach</td>
<td>899,030</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,443,118</td>
<td>80,324</td>
<td>16,094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Theinedes withdrawn.*
2380. By the Chairman.—What line do you wish to speak on?—I wish to speak principally on the Fitzroy line.
2390. Yours is professional evidence?—Yes.
2391. What are you?—A civil engineer, in private practice in the city of Melbourne, city surveyor for South Melbourne, and ship engineer for Calshot, Phyllis Island, and Findley.
2392. Do you know the route from Melbourne to North Fitzroy to Findley-street?—Yes, I have examined it.
2393. And the cross lines—Reilly-street to Johnstone-street, the Collingwood line?—Yes. I have examined the Railway proposals, and I have adopted their estimates with regard to the Fitzroy line and approval of their designs, as I do also, with regard to the Collingwood line practically; but the point chiefly that I ask your attention to is the proposal by which the Coburg traffic can be brought about from South Brunswick into the Preston line, curving in at the corner of the Royal Park, and by that means to have the whole of the Coburg traffic carried round by Fitzroy. The chief gain in that is that it enables the Fitzroy line to be worked by the existing engines and the rolling-stock which is now used to go to Flemington-bridge and Royal Park.
2394. I am afraid we cannot entertain a scheme of that kind, because it is only the southern suburbs we are considering, apart altogether from the service to Brunswick and Coburg. But I thought if it could be shown that at important points in the construction of the line the economical working of existing lines you might consider that as an important addition to the evidence to be taken as to the lines. Of course I must refer to your opinion.
2395. I hardly think we would be justified in making a recommendation to divert that line under our present instructions. The great trouble as to railways is not the interest on the cost of construction; it is on the working of the railways that the minus outlay occurs, and if it can be shown by any scheme that can be put before you that the working expenses become nil merely by the transfer from one line to another, of a line that must be kept in existence, by applying that to a new line without settlement or disadvantage, I think you will admit that as an important element.
2396. What is your idea of that?—From South Brunswick a loop south-east to the Carlton station. The Coburg traffic can then come through Carlton, North Fitzroy, and round into the Fitzroy station at a shorter distance than it normally has to travel through Royal Park and the Flemington station.
2397. Do you know the distances?—I think so. It is exactly a quarter of a mile less than the existing distance from South Brunswick—that is the only difference. The cost of that loop would be at the outside £12,000, which of course would have to be added to the cost of construction of the Fitzroy line.
2398. Your scheme is the loop that was pointed out to the Committee in your presence?—Yes.
2399. And then follow the Outer Circle?—Yes, and come round by Fitzroy; then with the loop that I suggested some years ago, and now adopted by the Railway Department, joining the Fitzroy line with the Preston. That again shortens the distance from Preston to Fitzroy by 3/4 mile into town. That service again which is now in existence also serves the Fitzroy line.
2400. Have you made out an estimate of the cost of that loop joining the Preston line with North Fitzroy?—I have adopted the Railway Department's estimate, and that is included in the £210,000—that is part of their scheme. The matter stands thus—that the working expenses, which is, is an important element in railway management, by Preston on the one part and Coburg on the other, will give a very good service indeed to Fitzroy, and, as I said before, thus save any additional working expenses, or practically all working expenses, on the Fitzroy line. The earnings on the Fitzroy line to make it payable will have to be only £7,000 or £8,000 interest on the construction of that line. With regard to the Reilly-street loop to connect the Heidelberg line, personally my own opinion is that now or in the future both the Fitzroy and Collingwood lines ought to be constructed in the interest of the northern suburbs, and in that way I would not recommend at present the construction of the Reilly-street connection. It will cost £55,000 or £70,000, and if the Collingwood line is made now or hereafter that money practically will be lost. I think, therefore, I would recommend its construction at present.
2401. Supposing that the Fitzroy line were constructed and not the Collingwood, how would you join the Heidelberg district traffic?—I think in that case that the work altogether should be done from Collingwood station. Of course there is a connexion into Fitzroy; that is a connexion that I think we would not pay to run pending the interval between the present time and the construction of the Collingwood line. I would leave that as it is, but not run it into Melbourne at all.
2402. There was a proposition lately and before to join from the Preston South railway on the Heidelberg or the Northern line; have you considered that scheme?—Of course I have considered those schemes, but I hold the opinion that both the Fitzroy and Collingwood lines should be made. If you cannot make them both now you will make one, and the one which I think by far the more profitable to the State is the Fitzroy; but the other must be made eventually, and any loop made connecting Fitzroy with Heidelberg would be a large expenditure wasted when the Collingwood line is subsequently made. I think that Heidelberg would have to just hold on with its present serious inconvenience unless both lines are made, which is the proper thing to do. I want to emphasize that by the connexion with Coburg; the existing Coburg traffic arrangements will give a good service without extra cost in train mileage.
2403. Supposing you diverted the Coburgline and Brunswick traffic to the Fitzroy line, what would you do with the line between Park-street and Findley-street?—I see the Engineer-in-Chief recommends doing a part of 1st Outer Circle line with a motor service; that would be ample, between Royal Park and Spencer-street, but if that traffic were abandoned altogether it would be to the profit of the State. There is nothing in it. North Melbourne is served splendidly by all the lines going through.
2404. What sort of traffic is there on that line from Royal Park, west of Brunswick, that is from Park-street to Spencer-street?—Of course Park-street will be served by the new arrangement. Royal Park might be the terminus of the motor service, but I think these can be very little traffic on that line— I cannot say very much. I have travelled through there frequently, and have seen very few people getting in or out at Märschall-road, Flemington, or Royal Park. The Märschall-road is served practically by Kensington.
2405. By the Hon. D. Malherbe.—Do you think the Fitzroy line can stand alone in this proposal?—I think generally as to the Fitzroy line, if we put aside the Coburg junction, which
I think would be a pity; even if that were done, there is a vast population in Fitzroy and North Fitzroy, and then with direct connection to Preston and Whittlesea, there can be no doubt it is a line that ought to be constructed.

2106. Did you estimate the cost of the Fitzroy line before the Railways Committee of 1865-91?—Yes, I did, but I do not remember my figures; I have not looked them up.

2107. You have made a new estimate now?—No, I have adopted the Railway Department's estimate.

2108. In doing that, suppose we say it is an extraordinary amount for those 3 miles of construction, setting aside altogether the property value; could you explain the high price?—I cannot explain that.

2109. You know the cost of construction put down?—£210,000.

2110. I speak of the Fitzroy connection merely: how do you arrive at such an extraordinary expenditure for 2½ miles, with a ruling grade of 1 in 50; explain to us how this cost is arrived at. We want that evidence from you to corroborate the Railway Department, either by facts or figures, to show how you have gone into it?—I have not gone into the cost of construction. I have not challenged the Railway estimate at all.

2111. If we say it is too high, what have you to say?—I think the Railway Department err on the high side in their estimates always.

2112. Can you give us any reliable estimate as to what this 2½ miles should cost per mile?—It would require very careful consideration; it is entirely exceptional work. I have not gone into the detail of the figures at all.

2113. If we knock 25 per cent, off it, will we be right?—I would not like to say that; it would take a great deal of time to estimate that.

2114. You merely tell the Committee that the Railway Department are sure to have made it big enough?—Yes, that is the whole length I am prepared to go.

2115. On the last occasion you went into it?—Yes. It was a new thing altogether then; since then the Railway Department have practically adopted these suggestions.

2116. About the Collingwood side, you have gone into the figures for that?—No; I also accepted the figures of the Railway Department as to that. I thought that in comparing the two lines, whatever cost they made in the one they would probably make in the other. The only thing I disbelieve their estimates is, that for the working service of the lines they treat Collingwood as having its terminus at Clifton Hill, and therefore a train mileage of about 3 miles whereas they charge the Fitzroy line with working expenses of 4 miles up to Northeale. I think that is manifestly unjust in comparing the two lines together.

2117. Why do you call this 2½ miles exceptional work?—The tunnelling and large extent of bridge work there have to be carefully taken out. I could do the work for you if you gave me time. So far as the Reilly-street connection costing £118,000, I believe that could be done for about £70,000.

2118. By Mr. J. S. White.—The present estimate is £107,000.—Well, I think that can be done for £70,000.

2119. For what reason then could not the other be reduced pro rata?—For this reason, that their estimate for that particular work is for a viaduct all the way. I see no reason in the world why it should not be done with embankment all along Reilly-street, therefore that would not apply to the other part of the work. In that their mode of construction is the only one that can be adopted.

2120. Have you seen the schedule as to how they arrive at the £210,000?—No.

2121. If you saw that you might say the work is not worth so much per cubic yard?—Yes, I would be very happy to go over it for the Committee, but to take out all those quantities is a very serious undertaking—a month's work.

2122. You say by going from Colling to Fitzroy there would be a saving in the traffic cost?—Yes: the great difficulty in railways is not the cost of them, it is the working of them, and if you can get the existing services diverted as to suit the new line, practically then you have no working expenses.

2123. You think if the Colling and Preston lines were brought in it would give sufficient service to serve Fitzroy in the number of trains?—Yes, until the time when the traffic got over to the railway and more trains were required, that is a time you are looking forward to with pleasure when you could give them more service if it were needed for the traffic.

2124. By Mr. Goss.—You have estimated the route connecting the Fitzroy line by Reilly-street with Clifton Hill?—Yes; that can be done for £70,000.

2125. I suppose you are acquainted with the figures of the Department?—They are £118,000 for 1896, and it can be done now for £70,000.

2126. Do you know the proposal of Mr. Reamish, south of Johnston-street, connecting with the Collingwood station, what do you think of that?—I do not like either of those lines because I am a firm believer in the advisability of making both main trunk lines, consequently when the time comes and these lines are both made any expenditure in those other places will be so much money thrown away.

2127. Assuming that only one line can be made for many years, would it be expedient to make a line south of Johnston-street?—It would be a very great expense.

2128. Apart from the expense it would ruin Collingwood station and the Fitzroy people?—Yes, it serves both lines. The only thing is that the Collingwood district, south of Johnston-street, is left in the lurch.

2129. Do you know the country in here, north of Richmond?—Yes.

2130. Assuming that such a line as Mr. Reamish's were carried out, do you think that another scheme would be to run a line from Wellington-parade or the creek road towards Studley Park?—I do not think it would pay at all. The great thing is to save all this great roundabout where people will not travel. They will walk if there is not a tram rather than go round a circuit.

2131. This would not take them round a circuit!—But it ends there—[pointing to the plan]—and would be simply a cockspur line.

2132. You do not think the dense population, south and west of Studley Park, and between Studley Park and Collingwood, would justify a cockspur that length?—I have not thought of it. I have not considered the matter in that connexion.
243. Do you know the scheme marked yellow here on this plan, known as Milban's?—No, I have not studied the matter at all.

243. By Mr. J. S. White.—You said just now you were in favour of two lines, and there should not be a connection between the two?—Yes.

243. You are aware that the Outer Circle line was made from Oakleigh to bring the traffic round to Spencer-street on to Fairfield?—Yes.

243. If Fairfield were connected on to the bridge at Merri Creek, would not that be advisable?—Yes.

245. That in future the Kew traffic might come through and go direct to Spencer-street?—No, doubt, in the future when we get to better times, and the traffic increases, it will be the thing to do.

245. This costs £16,000, according to the estimate; would not it be desirable to do that as it would go to Hoddle's Bridge at Kew, that is, if the Fitzroy line were made?—Yes, I think that is well worth consideration; it would serve all the important districts.

245. By Mr. Harris.—You say as to the railway estimates that the Department are sure to have made them high enough?—Yes.

245. Can you give us some instances where the work has been done for less than the Department's estimate?—I think of late years, since the fiscal of the undertakers on the Lilydale and Healesville lines, they have always erred on the side of high estimates, but I cannot give you any particular case. I would do the same thing myself.

245. Do any of your instances where they have underestimated the cost?—I do not know any instances of late years, not for several years back.

246. The last dozen years?—Eight or ten years. I think they have generally estimated fully. At the same time I do not think too much importance to my saying no, because I only speak generally. I might say that a very important factor in the estimates is the value of land. I think the Railway Department are justified in putting their estimates high because that is an uncertain quantity; it is not like work which you can measure by the everyday experience of tenders. The land is a little higher lately; there is a little better feeling, and there will be a great deal more confidence in the value in this district when the railway is about to start.

The witness withdrew.

John Mounsh, sworn and examined.

245. By the Chairman.—What are you?—A civil engineer. I have had five or six years' actual experience of railway construction, and twelve years' general experience in my profession. I am an Associate Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers, London, and Master of Civil Engineering in the Melbourne University, and an qualified under the Water and Local Government Acts. My experience of railways was incidentally in connection with the Coliban railway, in numerous railway sidings in connection with contractors' works, and in the construction of the Outer Circle railway from Fairfield Park to Oakleigh, and a portion of the Glen Iris railway. I was employed by the contractor.

244. Do you know the northern suburbs?—Yes, I have been all over the routes of the various proposals, and have examined the country carefully.

245. Have you made any estimate of the cost?—No, I have not, except incidentally in connection with the Coliban loop and the Reilly-street loop, because the work involved in making out quantities would be very considerable.

246. You have heard Mr. Minna's evidence; have you anything to add?—I would like to supplement his evidence with actual figures in a number of cases. For the information of the Committee I have put the figures in tabular form, and I would like to put them in and explain them—(handing in the same). I am taking substantially the proposals which were described in Councillor McMillan's evidence, and I have made a complete financial estimate of the cost and working expenses, to show the probable financial result of that proposal. The proposals consist of the Young-street route from Princes' bridge to Fitzroy, a loop from Fitzroy to Northcote, and another loop from Carlton to South Brunswick, the object of the whole extension and connection on the Young-street route to the traffic of the two northern branches. I have taken Mr. Rees' estimate of the cost of construction of that portion up to Fitzroy, which is £230,319, and my estimate for the loop line at Coliban is £10,000, including cost of land, making a total capital cost of £240,319, and the interest on that, at 3 per cent., is £8,411. Taking the working expenses, that part of the subject discloses the gist of the whole proposal; it amounts to a division of certain existing traffic on the one hand from the Coliban line, and on the other from the Preston line, on to the Young-street route. In order to arrive at that, I have estimated from the time-table the actual running performed at present, and that is set out in detail in Appendix B of my paper. It amounts to a saving of 179,000 train miles per annum. In regard to the new railway, the Young-street route, the Commissioner of Railways has, in his estimate, proposed a service equal to the St. Kilda service, and that, on the basis of a 1-mile journey, works out to an annual train mileage of 181,500 miles. It will be seen that the total increase in running to serve the new line is only 2,200 miles per annum, and taking the cost per train mile as given by the last Railway Report, the increase of working expenses is the normal sum of £142, making a total annual cost of £8,525. What can be done is to take the trains at present running from Flinders-street to Coliban or Preston or Collingwood and run them on the Young-street route—two same trains, the same staff and the fuel expenses will provide for substantially sufficient traffic for the Young-street route.

247. By Mr. Barton.—Then all stations, North Fitzroy, Royal Park, and other stations in that direction will be left out in the cold altogether?—Not North Fitzroy. The only stations left unprovided by this scheme would be Macalister-road, Flemington-road, and Royal Park. North Carlton would be served by the Brunswick trains; North Carlton would be the first stopping station after South Brunswick, running eastward. The total revenue from those three stations to be left out is £2,800 per annum. There are 3 miles of running to do to run that, whereas the cost of the Brunswick line, 2 or 3 miles, earns £17,000 from passengers alone.

248. By the Hon. D. Schroder.—When you have arrived at Young-street, where do you break off for the Brunswick station?—It is for that reason! No, I would run a service somewhat similar to the present one; it is run to Hawthorn—some Kew trains running on to Kew on one hand, and on the other hand to Camberwell.
2445. Then you must put engines to run the Coburg traffic; you do not diminish the expense; you and the same service would do it. The train at present leave Flinders-street for Brunswick, instead of passing round through North Melbourne, would pass through Fitzroy, and those leaving Flinders-street for Preston, instead of running through Royal Park, would go through Fitzroy.

2450. Do you think this Fitzroy line on the estimate standing alone will pay?—Yes, and my figures will show that. As to the second phase of the estimates, viz., revenue, I have divided the reverse to be expected into three groups. The first is the Fitzroy line, the local traffic up to Spencer-street, bunched on the east by Wellington-street, Collingwood; the west by Station-street, Carlton; and on the south by the Fitzroy Gardens. The population of that district has been taken out carefully by computing the tenements—it comes to 25,000. The next is the group-bounding the present line of railway near North Fitzroy and North Carlton stations, about a quarter of a mile on either side of the line; that has a population of 10,000, making a gross population—new population to be served by the Young-street route—of 45,000. In order to arrive at the travelling capacity of the public, I have compared other lines of railway, such as the Coburg line as it stands at present. It has a travelling capacity of 50 journeys per head per annum; so in taking 50 journeys per head I am well within the mark. That brings out a revenue of £14,062 in passenger revenue alone, and making the usual allowance for foreign bookings, that is for increased traffic on other railways, I add £4,088. The next group is the northern suburbs railways, Coburg on the one branch and Preston on the other. Both at present have to make a large circuit to get to Melbourne; the present revenue from both those lines now, the South Brunswick and Northcote, is £9,400, that is for 1891—about half to each. The details are given in the return which has been put in this morning by Mr. McMahon. My view is that it will be safe to count on an increase of 50 per cent. on the present revenue consequent upon a shorter route and more direct service. I have set down the profit to be expected on those railways at £4,760. The last item is no estimate for parcel, mails, and sundries, which I have set down similar to the St. Kilda line, £1,000 per annum, making a total revenue of £24,000 per annum. I would like to say there would be the goods traffic from a very large proportion of the present northem suburbs, but as I have not made any arrangement for the working cost of the goods traffic, I have taken credit for the goods traffic revenue, and the estimate so stand are merely passenger revenue estimates. Comparing the £25,000 with the annual working cost, I show a profit of £15,000 per annum, which, in my opinion, should be realized from the commencement. If the Coburg loop be put on one side and not considered at all, and only differences in the estimate then would be the 17.67, I would expect to be keenly contested by about £2,000, and the working expenses on the new route would be greater, but by an amount which I am not able to give you just now. It would still leave a substantial profit for the Young-street route.

2551. By Mr. J. S. White.—Do you know the distance between Prince's bridge and Royal Park?—Four and a half miles.

2555. And from Brunswick to Coburg?—Two and three-quarter miles.

2555. Then why carry passengers 4½ miles to Royal Park, the traffic between Melbourne and Royal Park being £2,000?—Between North Melbourne and Royal Park.

2555. What is the traffic from Melbourne to Royal Park?—No, the station I named was between North Melbourne and Royal Park—taking the earnings of each station.

2555. By Mr. Barton.—For Royal Park station the business at Melbourne should be taken?—Then I cannot see in what proportion that goes to Royal Park?

2555. Mr. Coates.—Are there any returns in the schedule?—I have not seen those for 1896, but my figures are reliable enough for comparative purposes.

2555. By Mr. J. S. White.—What distance is it from North Melbourne to Royal Park?—About 3½ miles.

2555. Then it is a longer distance between Royal Park and North Melbourne than between Royal Park and Coburg?—Yes, a longer distance by a mile, nearly.

2555. And you say the earnings the company receives between North Melbourne and Royal Park are about £2,000?—Yes, and between Royal Park and Coburg £7,000.

2555. Can you tell us the loss there would be in going over those 3½ miles and carrying those people with a revenue of £2,000?—That is a difficult question to answer.

2555. If there is no loss here, do you gain in going to Fitzroy?—You gain in this way, that after leaving South Brunswick, will all the way through pick up passengers and set them down—that engine and these earnings will have an increased earning power.

2555. They would pick up any only between the Sarah Sands Hotel and the station coming to Fitzroy?—It will have a gathering ground of 15,000 people to pass through, whereas by the Royal Park route it is 2,300. If a train leaving South Brunswick and going to Melbourne went round Royal Park way, it would have in its journey to North Melbourne a gathering ground of 2,300. If it went through North Fitzroy and Fitzroy it would have a gathering ground of 60,000.

2555. Say there was a line to Fitzroy by Preston coming in and taking this piece by itself between the Sarah Sands and the junction, what extra traffic would it get?—It will have a gathering ground of 10,000 people (before it arrives at Spencer-street, that is, North Carlton, and North Fitzroy), before it reaches the Preston junction.

2556. How many train now from Spencer-street to there!—There is a pretty large revenue from those two stations to Spencer-street now.

2556. Providing a line were taken round from Coburg to North Fitzroy, would you recommend the taking up the line from North Melbourne to Royal Park?—No; that line is of substantial use for goods traffic, and it is a district that may increase. There is a certain amount of population that can be served by a motor.

2556. Would you run a motor from there with a revenue of £2,000 only?—That is a separate question.

2556. No. If your line is made those people will have to be served?—I think they should be served by a motor, as suggested by the Commissioner, running, instead of to North Fitzroy, to Royal Park—of it pays.
2468. If it did not pay you would not run it — That is a question. If you run the railways on commercial principles, you might not; but I would not say they should not have the convenience. I would sooner run a line that would pay.

2469. As to those statements being constructed along Flinders-street, what is the price of brickwork? From 25s. to 30s. per cubic yard. Bricks are going up now; but that is what I would say a little time ago.

2470. What are girder value? — That class of girder was particularly expensive — over £20; they were steel. You can get them between £20 and £24 a ton now — plate girder.

2471. You think it would be safe to put down for brick in cement 40s.? — Yes.

2472. By the Hon, D, Merriell — Have you looked at the departmental estimate as to the cost of the Fitzroy line? — No.

2473. We want your corroborative evidence as to the cost proposed by the Department. Is that correct. Can we rely on it or not? — I am in the same position in regard to that as Mr. Munroe. To make such an estimate would require a large amount of work.

2474. Then you have collected statistics, of which we have plenty; but we have nothing to corroborate the Department's figures. You cannot give us anything: — Not directly.

2475. You cannot say whether Mr. Egan's estimate will be 25 per cent. over or under? — I cannot say, because estimating is not a matter of guesswork — it has to be gone through in detail.

2476. Do you agree with Mr. Munroe — that the official estimate is sure to be on the safe side? — Yes. Looking at the actual cost of railways in Victoria in the past, there is no line, with the single exception of the short line from Williamstown to the pier, that has ever cost anything like £80,000 a mile.

2477. What is the total cost of that 235 miles — not the compensation for land, but the cost of construction? — I admit it does undoubtedly look a high amount; but I am not justified in saying that without going into the figures.

2478. You just swallow it? — No. I would have to inquire into it to give an opinion. I should be happy to look into the Railway Department schedule and give my opinion.

2479. By Mr. Caven — Presuming they have not complete plans and specifications of the work, and have merely made a little design — say of quarter of a mile — to get a specification, what would you place on that estimate? — Very little, indeed. A rough estimate generally is a very poor method.

2480. Unless you have everything complete there is very little value in an estimate? — Very little; for this reason, these lines have all sorts of incidental items that will add to the cost. In one half-mile there may be a number of bridges, and in the next none. It requires detailed number of bridges. The permanent way and mouting is an infinitesimal part of the cost in such a line, and everything depends on the type of construction. If you go in for an expensive type of brickwork and cut stone, you can easily double your estimate.

2481. By Mr. Burstow — As to no other line having cost that amount, have you looked to see whether any other line has been constructed through a densely populated district for a short distance? — The nearest approach to any section of it my knowledge was the Outer Circle railway; the bridges were very numerous, three or four per mile in parts, and the cost of that line was only £15,000 a mile.

2482. Do you think the cost of the bridges will be anything like the compensation for property? — Undoubtedly that is the principal expense.

2483. Where is the comparison, then, when comparing like with unlike. You compare a country line which may have been extravagantly constructed, but through land easily acquired; how can you compare those? — Deducting £50,000 from the estimate leaves £15,000, and that amount still seems a very large sum. Leaving out the land, the comparison I made with the Outer Circle line becomes almost; but assuming all the buildings to be pulled down and cleared away for the £50,000, it still seems a very high amount for that short railway.

2484. By the Chairman — More than three times the cost of the Outer Circle? — Yes. The line from Melbourne to Belegrade cost £17,000 in the old days when work was expensive.

2485. By Mr. J. S. White — Have you made an estimate of the value of the properties? — No.

2486. Then the persons employing you to do this work did not give you that work to do? — No; I have not gone into that question at all.

2487. Did no one suggest to you that the Committee should know? — No. I regarded that my commission in this matter was to accept for the purposes of argument the estimates put forward by the Department, and endeavour to show that even on those estimates the Fitzroy line would pay.

2488. Supposing they are not correct? — They would have to be very incorrect to affect the general question of paying beyond non-paying.

2489. You think the line would pay if the land cost £140,000? — Yes; my figures show that, and I put them forward to be examined not criticised.

2490. By Mr. Caven — You said the distance to the Royal Park was 4½ miles, and from there to Coburg 2½ miles? — Yes.

2491. You admit that there would have to be some service to Royal Park? — Yes.

2492. Will it not cost as much to run a train to Royal Park as to Coburg? — Oh, no.

2493. When you are actually running? — No, there are running expenses for the fuel and water.

2494. Assume you run to Royal Park, how much more would it cost to run 2½ miles further each trip, because you have the station hands in any case? — Not in any case, if you run a motor service.

2495. Did the dead expenses of firing up and getting a start are a certain proportion, but when once you start every mile you run mean an additional mile of expense? They run pretty well pro rata 3s. 6d. a mile. I cannot give an estimate of the actual cost of running alone.

The witness withdrew.

William Charles Kerr, sworn and examined.

2496. By the Chairman — What are you — Professor of Engineering, University of Melbourne.

2497. You have been requested to examine the fit of the line in the Fitzroy line, I presume, by those interested in the Fitzroy line, what further evidence? — Yes, I was asked to accompany them over certain portions of the lines that were proposed to be made, especially the loop between South Brunswick and North Carlton railway stations, and then to appear here with reference thereto.
498. By Mr. Harris.—Who made the request?—Councillor McMahon, and the mayor of Fitzroy was with the party. We all went round together and inspected the proposed loop to which I have referred, and also went along the route of the railway as far as the present Fitzroy railway station to see the general character. Subsequently to that I spent a little time making an exact map of the proposed loop between South Brunswick and North Carlton, and came to the conclusion that it was perfectly feasible that a curve of from 15 to 20 chains radius could be put in connecting the two lines, with a gradient of not steeper than about 1 in 55, and with but little interference with property, and that property of a comparatively cheap character; there was no grave engineering difficulty. I think the work could be done at that point for probably £10,000, apart from the cost of the property.

499. By the Chairman.—As to the loop, you have not gone into the question of the number of passengers that could be diverted by that loop from the Brunswick and Coburg service?—I presume the whole number of trains from Coburg might be brought in through Fitzroy to Prince’s bridge if so desired, or some of the trains might be sent one way and some the other if there were any reason for it.

500. Have you any idea of how the people who go by the Royal Park would be satisfied with the new route?—That is a matter for you to consider; but I should think they would be better pleased, for the new route passes through an enormously denser population than the old route. The chances of the inhabitants of Coburg desiring to visit the inhabitants of Fitzroy is, I should think, very much greater than the chances of their desiring to visit the inhabitants of Royal Park or North Melbourne.

501. Once people get a railway they are both to part with it?—I can understand that; they have had to do it in several cases, however. There are plenty of closed railways in this colony at the present time. I know a busy railway in this colony that was closed and destroyed—the St. Kilda to Windsor; that was a very busy railway that was done away with and destroyed; everything was removed.

502. It was not as important as this?—I should have thought it more important. I should have imagined that the traffic between St. Kilda and Brighton at the time that line was closed would have been very important. It seems to me that was a far more serious thing than this present case.

503. The Brighto people were clamouring for a more direct route?—Very likely; they might have had a more direct route without diverting the traffic.

504. We want to know, before we take steps to recommend such a thing, whether the people who are and ought to be considered would be satisfied with and urge this vacation?—I am not sure that they do, I have not asked them; but it seems to me that the devotion would, on the whole, be more convenient than the present route. I may say, as a resident in the Royal Park, not far from the North Carlton and Royal Park railway stations, that it seems to me that the North Carlton railway station is more likely to be needed than the route between North Carlton and Fitzroy.

505. Do you know the difference in the distance?—Yes, I have measured up the distances on the best map I could obtain, and I agree nearly with that given on this map which you have. I do not make the difference quite so much. The saving is 30 chains, according to this map; I made it about 20 chains, that is from Prince’s bridge station. I reckoned practically from the crossing from Swanston-street.

506. By Mr. Jow, D. M’Kelvie.—For all the up-country trains how is it a man to go? Supposing he is at the Sarah Sands; in order to go to Spencer-street to get his train you send him round by Fitzroy and by Prince’s bridge?—It would make very little difference; it would be slightly longer. The distance is a little shorter to Prince’s bridge, and about half a mile longer to Spencer-street.

507. While the Fitzroy people are objecting to a one-horse show, you are creating one for the people at Coburg. You suggest they should deviate from their stations and make acquaintance with Fitzroy at Young-street?—Yes, that is the suggestion, and I have been asked my opinion of that.

508. It can be done?—I wish to say first it can be done and for moderate cost, and if done, I think, on the whole, the public convenience will be better served. There are some disadvantages, but I think the advantages largely outweigh them.

509. Do you see any reason for complicating the question of the line to Fitzroy with this deviation?—I see this reason, that it would give a much more frequent train service on the Fitzroy line, and that would render it a more popular line. A city line, in order to be popular and useful to the public, must have very frequent trains. For example, the Metropolitan train from London, the trains about every three minutes. The more trains you can put through the Fitzroy line, the more likely it is to compete favorably with other means of communication.

510. Will we not get all the traffic of East Brunswick at the North Fitzroy station without the loop—will not North Carlton station take everything within half a mile now?—The North Carlton station may.

511. Without the loop.—No doubt it will without the loop—I do not know whether the North Carlton will. I should like to correct that; the North Carlton station is very badly handicapped, as against the Sydney-road train.

512. That will occur in any case. If you are shortening the distance to Prince’s bridge by way of North Carlton without the loop, will you not get all the traffic available north of the North Carlton station?—It depends on how the thing is worked, and what number of trains you run. At present the Whittlesea and the Collingwood trains are running over the line between Scotchmer-street and North Carlton, but if the Whittlesea traffic and the Collingwood traffic be brought in through Fitzroy to Prince’s bridge, where are the trains to come from to run from Scotchmer-street to North Carlton? That will be practically lost unless you put more trains, which must add additional expense.

513. Mr. Reayick proposes taking what he can get of that traffic by motor service; he is providing for that. The motor service will be slow, and people will have to change from one vehicle to another, which means a good deal of discomfort. People like to get into a carriage and go straight to their destination.

514. But you are providing that for the West Brunswick people from North Melbourne onwards, so it is the same thing again; there they have a motor service by the park or the other way?—I would rather have the motor service up through the back of the Royal Park, where hardly anybody lives, than through a densely populated and growing suburb requiring and deserving a frequent train service.
whereas, the other way it is a question of running through a country that has but little population, and never will have much, as against a country densely populated, and which will be more so. The country north of the Royal Park will be brought down very directly and conveniently to the Brunswick and South Brunswick railway stations, much more so than to the Royal Park stations. The country west of the Royal Park is low-lying, and not desirable, I think, for population.

2516. What part do you regard as low-lying—if it is 120 feet above the level of the sea?—I mean the part that is not 120 feet above the level of the sea, immediately on the west of the railway from North Melbourne to South Brunswick. You will find the country there is cut off as with a knife, and goes down into a low-lying undesirable place at the bottom of the Moonee Ponds Valley.

2517. Before you reach that at the Moreland-road you have a mile and a half of hill?—I am afraid we misunderstand each other. I am speaking now of the railway between South Brunswick and North Melbourne, which I say is a line that passes through country that has very little population, and will not have very much. Directly you get out of the low-lying land by the Moonee Valley.

2518. West Brunswick is about 150 feet above the level of the sea?—Starting from the north of the Royal Park up to Coburg, it is, and that is well served by the present line.

2519. I am surprised that you wish to create for those people a journey to Fitzroy; you say it is absolutely longer for them?—It is not further for them to Prince’s bridge, it is a little nearer by the present route to Spencer-street. Taking the average of the two I should say the two routes about balance in distance.

2520. By Mr. Cranen.—Is not there a fair population around Macauley-road and Flemington—bridge on the north and north-west side?—There is very little. There is low swampy ground, and then you get into the more level country when you are immediately on to the North-Eastern line.

2521. I mean the population along the Mount Alexander-road—?—There is a little population there by Flemington. Is there any there between Macauley-road and the Flemington tram?—As you go east from Macauley-road you begin to get population, but it is some time before you get into dense population or good buildings.

2522. By Mr. J. S. White.—Do you think if this line were constructed and came round by Fitzroy that the North Carlton station would have any more traffic than it has the way it is at present?—I think so. I think it is probable, for the simple reason that it is bringing the line into a more densely populated district.

2523. You say you reside not far from there?—I reside about the middle of the Royal Park.

2524. You would not travel by the railway?—I take the tram.

2525. Most people about there do?—Yes; I do because it passes my door.

2526. By Mr. Cranen.—Is it not just as legitimate to take the traffic from the North-Eastern line on the suburban junction right on through Coburg as it is just simply to draw a short line across at Coburg, and that would be much nearer for the North-Eastern traffic?—I am not aware of any reason why the North-Eastern traffic might not go that way. I do not know what reasons the Department have.

The witness withdrew.

Patrick W. J. Murphy, sworn and examined.

2528. By the Chairman.—What are you?—A farmer and fruit-grower, residing at Arthur’s Creek; that is about 65 miles from the nearest railway station, the Yan Yean station on the Whittlesea line.

2529. How long have you been there?—About 25 years. I have about 40 acres under fruit. The orchard varies a little; the oldest portion is about fourteen years old. Taking the average all through, I produce about 6 tons to the acre, averaging one year with the other when in full bearing.

2530. That is 200 tons you produce?—Yes; but it is not all in full bearing.

2531. How many tons does a tree when in full bearing produce?—About 5 tons on the average, taking one year with another, all kinds of fruit.

2532. If they were all apples and pears, an acre would produce more than that?—I do not say it would.

2533. Where do you send your fruit?—All of it by train from the Yan Yean station.

2534. How do you distribute it in the city?—In the Victoria Market. We have to hire a conveyance at this end and get it to market.

2535. Would it be more convenient for you if a line were constructed through Fitzroy?—Yes, certainly; it would make the road shorter, in the first place, and be better for the Whittlesea people using the Whittlesea station. It would bring us within a 25-mile radius, and make it cheaper for the people.

2536. How many people beside you use the railway at present, or do they send direct?—At present there are not a great many people using it, but in time there will be, undoubtedly—they are just beginning to use it. Comparatively, that district is only young in fruit-growing. All the Kinglake district which will come to the Whittlesea station is comparatively young in fruit-growing; they are just beginning. In a few years that will be a large fruit-growing district.

2537. You would prefer the Fitzroy line to the Collingwood?—Undoubtedly.

2538. If the Collingwood line were constructed, and not the Fitzroy, with a loop from Northcote, West to Clifton Hill, and that line went round by the Melbourne Cricket Ground, would you use it then?—I would just as soon use the line we have at present. I do not see that there would be any great difference.

2539. And you believe that the people in your neighbourhood who use the Whittlesea line at present prefer the Fitzroy to the Collingwood route?—Undoubtedly.

2540. Do the fruit-growers in your district deal with Fitzroy at present?—Yes, all their road traffic is through there, and they all deal there.

2541. Does any of the fruit that comes by rail come into Fitzroy?—Yes, a good portion of it. I have made a calculation of what is bearing in that district; there are about 750 acres in full bearing at the present time. Of course those people do not use the train now, but it will come to that that they will have to, because they will find the benefit of it.

2542. How far down the creek does that 750 acres include?—Down to Hurst’s, and then there are about a thousand acres besides not bearing that have been recently planted.
You do not include in your estimate those on Kinglake?—Yes; there are about 100 different growers, and they are increasing every year.

Your fruit season is on in some parts now, the strawberries?—Yes.

How long will the fruit season last with freight to the railway, commencing from now onward?—It commences in November, and finishes about the end of August.

Then the fruit traffic is practically nearly all the year round?—Yes, pretty well.

Is the fruit planting still extending?—Yes.

Was there as much put in last year as the year before?—Yes, more.

Is the feeling among the people to extend the fruit cultivation?—Yes.

Do you regard it as a paying business?—Yes.

You do not require to send mench of it right into the city?—We send all our fruit to the market at present. We export some fruit, and that all goes by rail direct to the pier.

A railway through Fitzroy with frequent trains will take the traffic that is now delivered by carrier?—It will take a good deal of it.

Is the place lagging for want of railway communication?—The district is, undoubtedly.

You think the railway will improve the whole of the district?—Yes.

Mr. Barton.—In consequence of money spent on the railway?—No, by having a direct railway.

How will it improve your prospects?—We will have a direct railway to the city.

I thought it was an asset to the producer?—The produce is one thing.

Is it the saving of your time in coming to Melbourne that will improve your prospects?—Yes.

How often do you come in?—Twice a week with fruit. Every grower travels with his own, brings it in a truck and takes charge of his own fruit.

Do you engage a whole truck?—We have a truck, and if we can fill it, well and good; and if not, others put theirs in.

Is there a large proportion of the whole grown sent by rail?—No.

Only a small portion?—Mr. Draper, one of the largest growers in the colony, sends all his by rail, and I send all mine by rail, and there are four or four others who do so.

You have seen the advantage of using the railway?—Yes.

What is the advantage?—The advantage is that when you have a big quantity of fruit you would require a great many teams on the road to carry it and there would be a great deal of expense. We can get it into town at the same time, but if our fruit is to increase, as it will, the expense by the train will be less.

Do the growers use their own teams?—Yes, but by sending by train our teams can be working at home.

You say the cost is about equal, bringing by your own teams or by rail?—That is for a comparatively small amount of fruit.

Would not the comparison apply to a larger amount?—If you had 100 acres of orchard you would have to hire teams, and it would cost a great deal. A man with a small orchard just uses his own team.

You think the advantage to the people will be that when they have a large output of fruit they will be able to take a large quantity by rail, whereas they cannot convey it themselves unless the present conditions?—Yes, that is it.

Is there any other advantage?—We can get it delivered in a better condition if we have proper accommodation. At present for the raspberry growers there is no proper accommodation. We want to get trains fitted up properly for them.

Do you say that the railway takes the fruit with less injury than by carrying it in yourself?—Yes, soft fruits; that is, if we had the proper cool trucks. As present we have only the ordinary "II" trucks, and the damage is considerable in hot weather.

Is your district suitable for the growth of raspberries?—Yes.

The Chairman.—Do you mean to say that it is an expensive to come by rail from Yan Yean, coming to the Victoria Market, as bringing your own team, including horse food and wear and tear?—That is for the small grower. A man who has 20 acres in bearing, it will pay him better to come by train—it will be cheaper. That is 3 or 4 tons of fruit a week coming in. If you are coming by train you have the same expense as you have going by yourself and paying your own fare, and having the expense with a small truck and a large expense with a large truck.

Mr. J. S. White.—If you had to employ horses to take it to town the same as by rail and you had to hire everything, which would be the cheaper?—By rail, certainly.

The Hon. D. Melville.—Will the traffic in fruit extend with a railway?—Yes; it is a payable business.

Mr. Harris.—Which station do you use?—The Yan Yean. We pay 4½d. a ton from there.

What is the average distance of the orchards in your district from a railway?—About 8 or 9 miles.

Do you find the fruit much injured in the cartage of 8 or 9 miles?—No.

Outside of soft fruits, what fruits do the best in your district?—Apples and peaches are principally grown, and pears.

In what areas is the land held?—They vary. An average of about 200 acres.

What other products are grown besides fruit?—That is the principal product they have to send to market. The population is increasing, and the land is not changing hands. It is mostly fenced land now. There is plenty of spare land in the locality fit for fruit-growing that has not been touched yet.

As suitable for fruit-growing as that already cultivated?—Yes.

Mr. J. S. White.—You said it did not damage fruit carting 7 or 8 miles to a station?—No.

Would it damage it taking it 25 miles?—The further you take it the more likely it is to be damaged. They are mostly bush roads with us to the station. From that on it is all hardened roads.

Would the fruit get more damaged than sending it by train?—Certainly. I have proved it.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to-morrow, at eleven o'clock.
THURSDAY, 5th NOVEMBER, 1886.

Members present:  
Mr. Cameron, Mr. Harris, Mr. Burtin, Mr. Craven.

William R. Bennetts, sworn and examined.

2365. By the Vice-Chairman.—You are a Fitzroy councillor?—Yes; I have been connected with the council for about fourteen years.

2366. Do you know this proposal for a railway from Flinders-street to Fitzroy?—Yes, very well. The people of Fitzroy have been agitating for it the last ten or twelve years.

2367. You know the two proposals—the one from Collingwood to Fitzroy and the other from Fitzroy to Flinders-street. Which of the two proposals will answer your district?—The Fitzroy line is the best in my opinion.

2368. As to the commercial value of the line?—We get large quantities of goods to the Fitzroy station. We have some business as far as Whittlesea for many years past, and our place was a regular place of call some years ago. We find a great benefit from the Fitzroy station now. We get our stuff down there from the different parts of the colony. I suppose we pay about £3,000 a year in freight. The Fitzroy station is of great benefit to us. Grain and chaff are our principal products.

2369. There likely to be a big trade developed in the district?—I think so. The greater part of our stuff comes by rail now.

2370. Has there been a widespread feeling about this railway during these fourteen years?—Yes, they have been agitating during that time very strongly. Other parts of the colony have railways and we have none in Fitzroy, and we think we are entitled to it and also the district beyond as far as Whittlesea.

2371. It has been said that you are sufficiently accommodated by the trams—?I suppose the trams are very useful, but the fees of the trams are 3d, and I suppose the railway fares will be less. The time does not matter much.

2372. The present railway to Spencer-street is of so value practically as a passenger train.—No, it is too far round.

2373. Is this proposed Fitzroy line likely to be a remunerative undertaking?—I think so, especially if Brunswick is brought into it.

2374. Supposing you got a time-table as suggested by Mr. Fitzpatrick, would there be a reasonable trade developed?—I think so. I think the trams are at about twelve minutes intervals.

2375. As to the named, would that militate against the success of the line?—I do not think so. Of course it would be better if there were none, but we cannot get over that.

2376. Is there anything else you wish to say?—I would like to see the Fitzroy line run through. It will be a great benefit to us 3d, and the country beyond us.

2377. If Parliament determines to construct only one of these lines, which would be the best for the country?—I am sure the Fitzroy would be.

2378. The Engineer-in-Chief says the Collingwood line would give a small profit?—It would not serve the public so well; it is out of the centre of population.

2379. Which line would serve the trading centre best?—Fitzroy decidedly, it is more central in every way.

2380. Upon what streets is the business most concentrated?—Brunswick-street and Smith-street; the Fitzroy line would suit both those streets.

2381. By Mr. Harris.—What quantity of stuff do you get a year?—A large quantity; I cannot say the total tonnage.

2382. You want the Fitzroy line constructed?—Yes, right through.

2383. Is there any inconvenience from the existing line?—No; taking it personally, it is very convenient as it is, but taking it as a public matter it would be very good to go through.

2384. As a matter or fact, taking things as they are, the railway as it is, and the trams as they are, is not the district fairly served?—It is, but it would be better if the railway went right through. Of course the trams are very useful.

2385. Having regard to the expense, would the same be worth the candles?—We think it would be very convenient and for the public good to go right through. It stops at Fitzroy now. It suits freight now only.

2386. What public demand is there in Fitzroy for the additional lines?—We hear it on all hands.

2387. Is it because of want of a little extra convenience, though they have a good deal already?—They think if they got a railway it will be cheaper.

2388. Is the cry for additional convenience more from the outlying districts than from Fitzroy?—They think it will be better for them if they get it through.

2389. Speaking as a citizen and a business man do you think, as far as Fitzroy is concerned, it is fairly served?—It is pretty well served, but it would be better served if we had the railway.

2390. By Mr. Burtin.—The advantage you see in this proposed construction of a railway appears to be the lowering of the cost of fares?—That is one reason.

2391. What fare do you pay now by tram?—Threepence each way.

2392. What do the workmen pay?—There are two trams a day for workmen half price, a return trip for 3d.

2393. Would you expect a return railway ticket to be issues at lower than that for workmen?—Yes.

2394. What would be the amount?—I cannot say. Suppose it was 3d, a day you could travel as often as you liked. They could go home and have their dinner.

2395. Do workmen take periodical tickets as a rule?—I suppose they would do so.
2516. Do they go to the suburbs and back to the city?—I cannot say. Our men have an hour for dinner and go home.

2517. Do they go to Melbourne for dinner?—No, they live at Fitzroy and some at Clifton Hill.

2518. As an employee of labour, is it your opinion that the workman would take monthly tickets in order to save money; what is your experience?—I cannot say as to that.

2519. You think the working classes would live near where they work?—Yes.

2520. Who are the passengers likely to be?—The people living in the neighborhood.

2521. Would they save money by that?—I think so.

2522. How much?—I cannot say.

2523. How much would you save?—I do not suppose it would be much. It might suit me to go in the tram and go direct to the city.

2524. As to the goods traffic; are the business people of Fitzroy fairly served, sufficiently served by the existing arrangements?—Yes; we are very well served. I do not suppose there would be a goods station in Fitzroy proper. I suppose the station would be for goods exactly where it is now.

2525. All the goods that would be possibly used in Fitzroy would be landed where they are now?—Yes.

2526. Is the Committee to understand that your view of this railway construction would be simply from a passenger point of view?—Yes, altogether, to suit Fitzroy and the district beyond.

2527. As far as Fitzroy is concerned, this railway extension would be simply for the purpose of conveying the passenger traffic?—Yes.

2528. Are you well acquainted with the district beyond?—Yes, as far as Whittlesea.

2529. Is there any difficulty now in getting produce to the markets at Fitzroy?—No.

2530. It would not be any better if the railway went through, as far as Fitzroy is concerned?—No.

2531. Then what advantage would there be if the railway went through, from the produce point of view?—I do not suppose there would be any. Still, taking the trade's view, it would bring people to come and do trade with us.

2532. Have you much property in Fitzroy?—I have a little.

2533. Outside your own business?—At Clifton Hill and Brunswick-street.

2534. Is it real-producing property?—We use most of it ourselves.

2535. Do you rent any?—Yes, a store-room.

2536. Do you have any land not yet built on?—A small piece at Northete.

2537. By Mr. Craven.—Do you know Mr. Renwick's scheme. This 2½ is the Fitzroy line, and this line is the Collingwood route.—[Showing map]. There is only a proposal to go along on the Fitzroy route to nearly Johnston-street, then he curves round into Collingwood station. Assuming that only one line is to be constructed, would that line serve the place?—I should prefer seeing the line right through. We have no objection to the Collingwood line as well.

2538. Would that line I have described, which taps the country south of Johnston-street, serve the district from a passenger point of view?—Apparently it would.

2539. You would rather have that than none at all?—Yes.

The witness withdrew.

John McLeans, sworn and examined.

2610. By the Vice-Chairman.—You know this proposed line from Melbourne to Fitzroy?—Yes.

2611. You represent Messrs. Foy and Gibson, Collingwood?—Yes.

2612. State what advantage it would be to you as traders and to the general community?—Speaking as shopkeepers, we get the advantage of people coming nearer to our place, direct to us from the northern suburbs; particularly if Brunswick would be brought in.

2613. Can you give us an idea of the number of passengers that come by existing conveniences, by tram or rail, to your business places?—We have between 4,000 and 5,000 every day.

2614. When you are carrying on your business, how many have you then?—We have [and as many as 15,000 or 20,000, the first day usually 15,000, and after that 10,000.

2615. From what quarters do they come?—We can only judge from the deliveries. We deliver to every suburb within fifteen miles of Melbourne.

2616. Is that trade developing generally in Fitzroy?—As far as we are concerned it is more and more every year, in spite of bad times.

2617. Taking the proposed fares of the Department—1½ miles to Johnston-street, 4d. first return; 3d. second return; and 8s. and 6s. monthly, what effect would that have on the trade of Fitzroy?—It seems very cheap. The principal advantage I see of this line is that persons coming from the southern suburbs and all stations landing at Flinders-street could go direct out to Fitzroy or Collingwood. Just now they have to go out of the station and walk up to Brunswick-street and get a tram.

2618. It would be an advantage to the railways all round, the other suburbs using the railways?—The southern suburbs will certainly benefit.

2619. The Government will derive some money on the southern lines?—Yes.

2620. As a business man would you say if these fares are adopted and the time of seven minutes taken to Fitzroy that it will take the trade to the railways?—North of Johnston-street, I think it would; south of Johnston-street, I think it is just a matter of accident. If a man sees a train coming along he would move into the station; if not, he will take the tram.

2621. You know the population of Fitzroy; would the monthly tickets ensure a large custom?—It is hard to say, because most of them walk in now—the working class.

2622. Would not the monthly tickets being a large traffic?—South of Johnston-street I do not think it would make any difference; north of Johnston-street it would.

2623. Compared with the 2s. 6d. a dozen tickets on the tram, would not monthlies on the railways induce large travelling on the railways?—It would certainly induce travelling in the morning and evening for the working people.
2654. Are they working people mostly in Fitzroy?—Mainly.
2655. How many thousands of the working classes are there there?—It is hard to say. There are a very large number of clerks and others who are employed in the city.
2656. Are you building larger premises?—We are building a large factory.
2657. Have you thought the matter over; will the Fitzroy line be remunerative?—I believe it will.
2658. Will it pay as well as the lines south of the river?—I believe it will, not at first, but about two years afterwards.
2659. If there is only one line to be constructed which will be the best?—As far as the Collingwood line is concerned it would make no difference to us at all. We should be as far away from the station as now.
2660. You regard the two lines as serving two different classes of people—the Collingwood line would not serve the people in Fitzroy?—No.
2661. A, I speak of the business people of these two streets?—I do not think the Fitzroy line will get much from Smithstreet as far as Johnston-street; beyond that it will get a lot.
2662. Then you would advise for the two lines to be constructed?—The Fitzroy first, and the Collingwood afterwards, when the Fitzroy pays.
2663. By Mr. Burton.—You say your goods are delivered in all the suburbs surrounding Melbourne?—Yes, by our own carts.
2664. If the railway were constructed, would you use it instead of your own carts?—No.
2665. Then the railway would get no advantage from your goods?—None whatever.
2666. How do you receive your goods, all classes?—At Spencer-street.
2667. Why not at Fitzroy, which is said by Mr. Bennett to be quite convenient for Collingwood and Fitzroy?—We defer from Mr. Bennett in that. The English mail goods are delivered at Port Melbourne, and they are brought to Spencer-street and dealt with by the Customs, where the steamer discharges them at the wharf. They do not go to the railway at all; we get them direct.
2668. You would still carry all your goods that way if there were a railway to Fitzroy?—Yes.
2669. Then what advantage, as to goods, would the Department get from the line?—We send about 200 parcels to Spencer-street now; we would send them to Webb-street.
2670. Would you pay more for it if it was looked there than at Spencer-street?—Yes, we do not expect them to take them for nothing.
2671. Would you pay more if a parcel went 10 miles than 9?—Yes. Take the question where it is up to 100 miles—in many cases the additional mileage might make it over the 100.
2672. But within the specified distance it would not cost any more?—No.
2673. If your goods are delivered principally in the suburbs, how will the railways benefit by them?—The country trade, anything beyond 20 miles.
2674. What does a working man pay now by the trains from Fitzroy?—Threepence return.
2675. By rail it was also 3d., which do you think the working men would call themselves of?—If a workman is in the habit of going by train now he would go to the railway, because it only gets one train in the morning and he would get any amount of trains. If he misses his one train in the morning he has to pay 3d. or walk.
2676. Would the clerks in Fitzroy have time to leave the centre of the city and go to Fitzroy to lunch?—Yes, they do in large numbers in South Melbourne, where I lived for years.
2677. That would be an advantage to those people instead of paying for lunch in Melbourne?—Yes, they would patronize it on that score. There is another point, as to the settlement by Ivanhoe, Heidelberg, Preston, and other places; we have 1,800 employees in our place at present. Out of those there are about a dozen living in Heidelberg and if they could get direct communication, instead of a dozen there might be 1,200.
2678. By Mr. J. S. White.—Then you would deprecate Collingwood?—Yes, they would go to the healthier districts, where there is more room to live in.
2679. By the Vice-Chairman.—What is the nature of your business, is it fruit as well?—Everything, but we do not touch fruit.
2680. Where does the produce part come from?—As far as produce, we sell only butter and bacon.
2681. Then there is a direct trade for those goods?—It comes from Preston. It might come by train, but they would probably still prefer to deliver it by cart.
2682. By Mr. Harris.—You believe that the Fitzroy line would pay?—Yes.
2683. Have you gone into the question of the cost of the line?—I have seen that the estimated cost is 220,000L.
2684. Have you gone into the question of the working expenses and maintenance and the revenue to be derived from it afterwards?—Only on the figures shown by Mr. McMahon.
2685. Did you see anything in the figures supplied by him to differ from?—Yes. I differ only as to including the traffic beyond Nicholson-street. I do not think he will get that; that will go to the tram cars or the people would walk.
2686. Have you thought it out very carefully?—Only generally. I studied those particular figures he showed me. Long ago we got so disgusted over the thing being hung up so long that we had come to the conclusion that we were not likely to get any railway. We have not taken any direct interest in it. It is the first time I have been examined about it. Our firm has taken no interest in the movement.
2687. You have been indifferent as to it?—We were too busy.
2688. By Mr. J. S. White.—Would any of your customers, inside the radius of Clifton Hill, come to you by railway?—No.
2689. From the southern suburbs?—We would get nine-tenths of those, especially if they had children with them. They would come right through to Webb-street.
2690. There is a transfer in the trains?—They give you transfers towards Johnston-street but not back again. I come from the southern suburbs myself and would certainly go to Webb-street.
2691. By Mr. Burton.—Have you examined the new classification of goods, the present rates issued a week ago by the Railway Department?—No.
2692. Did you not notice that they have instituted a class called "smalls," between parcels and goods, that may be sent at a very low rate up to 100 miles?—I noticed about that in the papers, but I have not gone into the detail.

2693. That would alter your evidence as to the transit of goods outside the suburban radius. If you could send 3 cwt, would that cover the parcels you send by rail outside your delivery radius?—That would bring in a bit more that we now send by cart to Spencer-street.

2694. Would it not take in all?—No. The grocery deliveries are over 3 cwt, often. As a general thing, an order from the country includes three cases of kerosene and two bags of sugar.

2695. Can you give an approximate idea of the amount of your business to the country up to 3 cwt. orders?—No; I have not the figures.

2696. Would not cover the bulk of your country deliveries?—It would cover half.

2697. Then the half of the possible advantage from your place would be taken away by the new classification of "small"?—No; it would certainly increase the amount of traffic from Webb-street station to Spencer-street.

2698. Then, it would increase your business?—It might; instead of sending to Webb-street we would send to Webb-street.

2699. And it would make no difference to the railway?—It might.

2700. By Mr. A. White.—As to the small goods which you deliver by your own carts if they were taken on the railway up to 3 cwt. would you send more by rail?—No, because we have to deliver at the customers' houses.

2701. If you were delivering goods to Heidelberg?—We deliver goods there now once a week, sometimes two or three times a week, but I do not think we could say we would send by rail. We deliver to Williamsown.

2702. Would you not send 3 cwt. by rail there?—No, because we have to deliver at the people's houses.

The session withdrew.

Mr. Cameron here took the Chair.

Percy Remble, sworn and examined.

2703. By the Commissioner.—What are you?—Manager for Henry Ackman and Co., furniture warehouse, Smith-street, employing about 60 hands.

2704. You want a railway for your business?—I have a statement here made out that I could give you some information on. I am not a great political man. I do not take great interest in railways, but my own opinion is that a railway through Fitzroy would benefit us to a considerable extent, and I have reasons here for saying so.

2705. By Mr. Buxton.—You mean Ackman and Co. when you say "we"?—Yes.

2706. By the Commissioner.—What is the statement?—About five years ago, in September, 1891, when things got so very depressed we thought we would create a traffic by putting on various cars to various districts and charging low fares. We started to subsidize cars. The first cab we started was to Northcote, charging 1d. sections. The cab-stand was at our door in Smith-street, and from there to Northcote-bridge we charged 1½d. and from there on to Separation-street, Northcote, another 1d. The trains charged 3d. from our door to the Clifton Hill terminus, and the Northcote train charged 3d. again; that was 6d. against our 2d. We started this cab and gave the first man £2 a week as subsidy and the traffic increased. We put on a second and third and so on, and as it increased more cars came and we found we could reduce the subsidy so that the cabmen could get a living still at the same fare. This increased so much that we found we could do without subsidizing the cabmen at all, and evidently it woke the trade up, and they sent men to stand about our firm's shop and at different points on the routes to ascertain the number of passengers travelling by our cars. The result was that, after a few weeks close scrutiny, they found that our traffic was so large that it would pay them to run penny sections from Johnston-street to the bridge, which they took up at once and wiped our cars out altogether.

After that, as you are aware, the Northcote tram got into financial difficulties and stopped running. Subsequently it was started under a new proprietorship, and they have been running at 1d. and 2d. sections ever since from our bridge; but as far as we are concerned that route is defunct altogether. Then we turned our attention to North Fitzroy to meet all trains coming from Whittington and Heidelberg on that line. We did the same with that and spent between £200 to £1,000 subsidizing cars and advertising, but to no effect; they did not come to the streets and would help us. We tried to get them to assist, but they would not and we took the whole matter in hand ourselves, and we think we benefited by it by creating a traffic to our door. We started the North Fitzroy line and that increased the same as Northcote, until some fourteen months ago we were only paying a small subsidy. Mr. Ackman, my late employer, died, and the thing was left in my hands entirely, and I found that those cars were still increasing, and men were coming on without any subsidy and leaving other streets and coming to us, so I knocked off the subsidy altogether, and the result has been that up to now there are something like sixteen waggonsot on and off at our door. In the busiest parts of the day twelve to sixteen, and in the morning early perhaps four to five daily on an average are at our door now. There are 49 vehicles here, and they run six trips each to this North Fitzroy station, and on the average we reckon they carry six passengers. Some are licensed to carry twelve, but so much is the pressure of trade there that women with children get up with the drivers and ride in front, which you see in no other part of the colony. The cars are packed tight, and sometimes those vehicles licensed to carry only six carry fourteen, men, women, and children.

2707. What is the fare there?—A penny. The cabin takes them about a mile and a half for a penny. Each cabin carries 35 passengers during the day. A man six trips there and six back, six trips of six passengers each, and nine vehicles averaging nine, 294 single passengers daily, six days a week, that equals 1,944 single passengers per day. On Saturdays they run three trips each extra, which gives a weekly single passenger traffic of 2,106, and 22 times that gives 10,500, and if you double that for return fares for a line you get is somewhere about the whole of the passenger traffic on that line. Sundays, of course, are exempt altogether. The trains pass our door. You
can get a transfer at Johnston-street, from Smith-street to Johnston-street, since you can get a transfer from Smith-street to Johnston-street, which is one of the easiest ways to get to Nicholson-street station. But taking all that into consideration people travel in those cars, and we find that the more regularly we can run the cars the more traffic is created. Then we tried two other districts—Alphington and Fairfield—wits lil. forests, and we found that in that direction, near Cliff Hill trams, we could not develop traffic there at all. It has been running for four or five years, but up to the present only one car runs, and only six trips a day, so that line was actually a failure. Then we tried another line from Collingwood station, Johnston-street, below Hoddle-street. Those are our time-tables issued some time ago. They are out of date now—something in copy. We time our tables to meet the various trains coming into Collingwood, but we could not create any traffic that way, and we had to knock it off. Then we tried another line from Bridge-road Richmond, Hawthorn-tridge, cadd Campbell-parade, Bridge-road to Church-street, near the Town Hall a penny section. From the Town Hall up Church-street to the Lord Regent, Simpson's-road, another penny section. From the Lord Regent, Simpson's-way, through Hoddle-street passing close to the new projected Collingwood line, passing the Town Hall, coming into Hoddle-street to catch the traffic we failed to get before; then coming up Johnston-street and back to our warehouse at Smith-street. We tried that for some time, and it utterly failed, although it was penny section. When those failed we kept one car going, subletting the line. Instead of switching off up Hoddle-street we ran it straight through Victoria-parade till it reached Smith-street, and then crossing Gertrude-street to our warehouse. The result is trying to tap that portion of Richmond, and the whole of Collingwood at the bottom, we could get no traffic at all, and now only one car runs four or five trips a day, and about six passengers each way. That is the whole of the traffic we have created, while on the North Fitzroy line we have created a traffic, which, I believe, could be increased, with a little better service, to over 200,000 passengers per annum at penny fares.

2768. What do you desire to prove by these figures?—That, so far as railways are concerned we have no railway accommodation, and if a line were constructed through Fitzroy, no doubt the bulk of this traffic would go by train instead of riding in close-cooped up cars, because no doubt those cars would not run after the railway carriages and depots were closed. No Smith-street line. 2769. I mean as to why you showed you could not get passengers from Hawthorn?—Because we tried to tap the whole radius right round to North Fitzroy, and I gave the result.

2770. By Mr. J. S. White,—Is there any reason why the results were so?—Only that we put in that North Fitzroy was more densely populated and more of a travelling public or coming through the thoroughfares crossing Brunswick-street brought us more trade than the other way. We reckon that the Collingwood station people went on to the North Fitzroy station and got out there, and made that more their terminus.

2771. Do you sell much cheaper than at Bridge-road, Richmond. How could you take the traffic from there to Smith-street?—I think it is a noted thing that there is no street anywhere in the colony that does a trade equal to Smith-street on account of the low prices. People come to Smith-street from all parts of the colony, and a small portion of intercolonal trade is done there, which is not done in any street outside of Melbourne.

2772. What do you mean by low prices, do you mean you give better value for the money?—In some instances. No doubt the cutting is very keen in Smith-street, so many large firms there, and so many shops open that the cutting is so intense that the public get the benefit of it.

2773. By the Chairman. Did your car enterprise increase your business to any extent?—All through the depression we were fairly busy, and this last month, October, has been the best month we have had for two years, except the December month, which proves that we have done the trade, and whether it is through the cars or not, we realize that where we can create traffic that business will increase.

2774. From what part are the bulk of your customers?—From all parts of the colony. We do a large country trade and a small intercolonal trade. We have sent something like 600 packages the last two weeks, by rail, which does not include a quantity of parcels to the other parts of the colony.

2775. What distance?—From one border to the other, north, south, east, and west. The metropolitan districts we do by vans. We have a large traffic in our own trade alone—from 7,000 to 8,000 customers a month. They represent £300,000 book debt, and we have about 12,000 people call at our office to make payments, independent of our trade, during Smith-street and Mount-street, which is a large traffic in itself, independently of any other trade we are doing. They come from all parts. We could not depend on the local trade. A number of other suburban districts depend on us and we just located. We have a line in Fitzroy people coming from the country would come to Fitzroy by railway rather than by tram.

2776. By Mr. Harris,—Where is the great bulk of your trade?—We do more in the metropolitan area than in the country.

2777. What would be the proportions?—I can hardly give that—it might be one-fourth done outside the metropolitan area.

2778. Is the intercolonal trade increasing or decreasing?—It is increasing. In fact, we have not done any intercolonal trade till the last eighteen months or two years. It is increasing slightly.

2779. By Mr. J. S. White.—At what part of Smith-street is your place?—The corner of Hodgson-street, one block from Moon-street, 200 yards below Fox and Gibbon's on the forestry side.

2780. Then you are a little further than Fox and Gibbon's from the Webb-street station?—Yes; perhaps 100 yards further to walk.

2781. Do you expect much traffic by rail from there if the railway is constructed?—I think it would pull the train traffic, and a number of people who walk would ride if it were cheaper.

2782. You mean those who wish to walk to your establishment?—Yes.

2783. You do not think it would increase your business, but it would take the traffic from the tram and supply the railway?—Yes; I think it would tend to increase business in the street. We are the lowest price shop in the colony, and if people could get cheaper fares more would come.

2784. With low fares you think more would come from the south to deal with you?—Yes.

The motion withdrawn.
Carries M. Davies, sworn and examined.

2722. By the Chairmen.—What are you?—Draper, outfitter, and tailor, Brunswick-street, Fitzroy. I have been there, as master, for about fourteen years, and have been in the place with my people for over twenty-five years. I have been asked to give evidence here commercially. I have heard the evidence given here by the business people of Fitzroy and Collingwood, and I agree with it. I embrace the greater part as to the trend of the traffic. I have lived away from my business in Heidelberg for the last seven years, and have lived also at Northcote, and I know the trend of traffic from those districts. We have done a fairly large business with people who have been bringing their produce into Brunswick-street for all the years we have been in business, and I notice that those people in their evidence, residents of Preston, Northcote, Epping, Whittlesea, and Heidelberg, say they wish to continue those business connections, and that would bring them much farther into the district than they come at present by the train. There is a point that I think seems to have been made rather much of in this matter, that is, the question of a Fitzroy or Collingwood line; I think that an equally big question is the convenience of the districts beyond to the north. I think by studying their convenience a very large and profitable traffic can be gathered for the railway. The system at present costs three-quarters of a million of money, and I believe if you give a connection with the other part of the system here, that it will be a most profitable thing. I notice the traffic managers have allowed for foreign traffic, but I think that they have not allowed for the interchange of traffic to all the suburban stations, which will be a very big thing; they will lift the traffic from the whole of those stations. I have noticed with disgust, when it is not really laughable, the efforts made by certain municipalities urged from some direction or other to trot out the tramway lobby. The idea of those people coming here and giving as an argument against a national railway that those lines are likely to revert to the municipalities if a line of railway is constructed is sheer nonsense. I have here an abstract taken from the tramway balance-sheet by Mr. Frederick George Wood, F.I.A.V., which I will, with your permission, read. It is as follows:—

Abstract from Balance-sheet of the Melbourne Tramway and Omnibus Company to 30th June, 1896.

Uncalled capital ........................................... £480,000
Freehold properties ........................................ 298,503
Cars, grips, &c. ............................................. 57,384
Municipal debentures ....................................... 87,955
Loans on mortgage ......................................... 43,150
Balance at credit of profit and loss ................... 267,728
Less dividends ............................................... 13,600
                                                254,128

£1,292,220

This is after making provision for all liabilities.

Paid during the Year.

After paying current expenses and trade liabilities.

Paid Dividend ............................................. £24,000
  Debenture interest ...................................... 76,050
  Sinking fund ........................................... 31,950
  Renewal reserve ....................................... 15,157
  Balance profit and loss ................................ 24,728
                                                  £171,885

Tramways Trust.

Present sinking fund, £550,000 at 4 per cent, by the year 1916 ................................... £766,850
£30,000 per year for four years with interest to year 1916 ........................................ 218,500

Total .................................................................. £1,005,350

Now the Tramways Trust have a sinking fund of £550,000, and if you put that at the present rate of interest, 4 per cent, by the time the rents fall in you would get an amount of £766,850; then these railways, if they were made, could not be constructed for, at any rate, two or three years. The trains would still put to sinking fund £30,000 per year for four years; by the year 1916 that comes to £288,000, or a total of £1,000,000 odd. My point is that they have a million practically if they throw up the sponge now; by the end of 1916 to meet this amount that was borrowed for the construction, £1,640,000. Then, you see, as against the thing falling in, they have assets to the tune of some £1,292,000, so the whole thing is ridiculous. I have suffered the inconvenience of travelling in from Heidelberg, an inconvenience shared by all the residents in the northern suburbs, and I think it is absurd that this thing should be put forward. To show what the trains are, by the earnings for the present year, after paying the working expenses, they paid in dividends £22,000; debenture interest, £76,000; sinking fund, £31,000; carried to the renewal reserve, £15,000; balance profit and loss, £24,000, making a total of £171,885 for one year's transactions. That is a thing not likely to fall in to any one. There were two classes of evidence given in connection with this, one from the northern suburbs that they want a railway, and giving their reasons for it; and the other class, that they do not want a railway, but if they had it they want it put as far away from the traffic as they can possibly get. Sir Arthur Snowdon suggested going to Bundoora, I, as a resident of Heidelberg, could understand that the meant that the railway on which the Government has spent a lot of money could never earn a penny to reduce what is losing now for all time; it is the most outrageous thing that was ever put forward. I have noticed that at present an entirely new way of
dealing with railway inquiries has been put forward, and the whole of the municipalities of the colony have been asked to object to the northern suburb having a railway line. This extraordinary opposition showed the necessity of pushing out clearly the position of the tramway Company, hence the short cut has been taken out by an accident, and the balance sheet also appeared is a very plain one and easily understood.

2726. By Mr. J. S. White.—If there is no railway it will be a better property.—That is not a national way of looking at it. I am looking at it in a national way, and I feel confident that it will be to the benefit to the State that they should connect their northern railways there that are not completed with a central station here. I have not the slightest doubt of that. In the railway evidence that was given they make no provision for what I consider almost the best part of the inner track for the passenger traffic, the stations at North Fitzroy and North Carlton—that is not catered for by any railway. If the line were run round that way instead of by Middle Northcote the thing would be fairly profitable, even on the departmental estimate of the traffic, and by the interchange of traffic it would revolutionize the whole system. The last witness told you that a line of cars tapping the North Fitzroy and East Brunswick districts, and following the route of this railway, lifted 200,000 passengers per annum. If a line of cars can do this, what splendid opportunities must exist for this railway to develop an immense passenger traffic, following, as it does, practically the same route.

2727. By the Chairman.—Our concern is to be satisfied that this line or lines would pay, if constructed; to get that, we must be satisfied that there is a large travelling population. Have you any knowledge that there is a large trade between the districts further north and Fitzroy and Collingwood?—There is very large business.

2728. Would the railway do away with people sending their drays and waggon?—If you provided goods stations at these different points there is no doubt it would to a great extent; goods stations about the centre of Fitzroy, for instance. A lot of our perishable goods, fruit and so on, would come that way because it would be very to the man who has to conclude it.

2729. Do you deal largely with the people further north?—Fully one-third of our trade.

2730. They take delivery personally at your establishment?—A great number of them.

2731. That is, people coming in with fruit and so on?—Yes.

2732. They generally lend back?—Yes.

2733. If the railway were constructed, would the railways get the larger proportion of that traffic?—No doubt a lot of parcels would be sent.

2734. If there were a station near the Town Hall, where freight is now being sold largely, would the railway take that traffic or would the drays still come in?—I think it would be a great distributing station there as a goods station. As regards the possibilities of the line in passenger traffic, the whole of the population of North Fitzroy, North Carlton, and these premises is essentially a travelling population, consisting of artisans and clerks. A great number of these people work in Fliinders-lane and that part of the city, and they would all travel by train. A very great number of them now take the tram or walk. Any man working anywhere on the south side of Collins-street—and that is where a great amount of business is done—would always travel by train.

2735. Do you do any business with the people on the south side of the Yarra?—We see a fair number of them.

2736. Do they come by tram?—Yes.

2737. Do you think a railway in Young-street would increase that?—It would lift an immense number of passengers.

2738. The tram passes your door at present?—Yes.

2739. You think they would rather walk from Young-street to your place from the southern suburbs?—I am sure of it. There would be some of them, perhaps, if they had to cross a tram or two to the station, who might take the tram, but a great number of them would take the train.

2740. By Mr. J. S. White.—In what part of Brunswick-street are you?—Between Gertrude-street and More-street.

2741. Is that the busiest part?—No, there is a busy part at the Alexandria-pavement, towards Johnston-street—the lower end. They got a lot of goods and provisions there. That has been helped by the goods station there.

2742. Have you considered whether this line would pay?—Yes, I have considered it for ten years. I am satisfied it would pay.

2743. Are you a property-owner?—I was cleaned out in 1888-9, but I still represent a lot of property as trustee.

2744. Would the property-owners contribute anything if the line did not pay?—As a trustee I would look at it very closely if it is to be the law.

2745. It would mean the interest on £88,000, the cost of the property?—I certainly would be inclined to agree of that.

2746. If there is a vote taken of the property-owners in Fitzroy they would be in favour of that?—I think so.

2747. By Mr. Harris.—Have you discussed the matter with some of them?—With some of the principal ones, but they all feel so satisfied that the line would pay that the point has hardly come up. It would be distributed amongst the other municipalities as well, and it would not be a very big thing and they feel that the whole thing would improve their property. We have looked at it from the point of view that there would be such a large saving, which should be credited to the thing, from the fact of not running over a useless track, 3 miles route by Royal Park, that there could be no loss.

2748. By Mr. J. S. White.—Was not that constructed partly at the request of the members of the Fitzroy Council—the Outer Circle line?—I know the connection was at their request, although I pointed out as one of the depredations before the line was constructed that the intention of Parliament was to bring the line straight down to the Heidelberg-road from Whittlesea, but unfortunately it was seceded from Nicholson-street down to that point. When we waited on Mr. Speight and pointed out that the intention was to bring it straight down, by which it would have been of great value, he said it was scheduled from Nicholson-street to Whittlesea and it could not be altered. As far as the Outer Circle was concerned, it was designed by Mr. Higginbotham, and I do not think the people of Fitzroy were asked to give their opinion about it or ever advocated it.
2749. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Suppose you had the time-table of Mr. Fitzpatrick, bringing you within three, five, and seven minutes, who would get the bulk of the passenger traffic—the railways or the trams?—A large proportion of all the daily traffic will go to the trams. Perhaps when a woman wanted to go a block or two to do some shopping she would take the tram; but the whole daily traffic in and out would go by the trams.

2750. Would the two things running together develop the district?—I believe it will.

2751. You have no fear of one injuring the other?—No. It will interfere with the trams at first to some extent; but if you give the facilities it will create such traffic that the public trams and railway will all benefit. I omitted to mention that Fitzroy and those districts right out there where they have the travelling population are the most densely populated districts that you can get. I know when I lived at Albert Park, and was working in Flinders-street, I always took the train, and never dreamt of taking the tram, though I had to walk across the tram some distance to the train. There is another point that I forgot to mention in dealing with the Tramway Company's balance-sheet. The Tram Company is in some extraordinary way seem to own the car-houses, and they have some city property; but they do not own the engine-houses—those belong to the municipalities. I presume the car-houses would have to be purchased by the municipalities. They have freehold properties, £298,000, on their balance-sheet. It is extraordinary how the municipalities allowed them to have that.

2752. By Mr. Craven.—What is your opinion of Mr. Renick's proposal—the Johnston-street loco?—My opinion of the route is that it would adequately serve the whole of the northern suburbs, and would give Collingwood people a better line than the Hoddle-street line. It would give an extra station for them in Collingwood, and would take a line right through the very heart of the thickest population they have got. I think it is the best scheme that has been put forward.

2753. By Mr. J. S. White.—That would not serve Collingwood?—It would supply the centre of Collingwood. The only other scheme I have is—Johnston-street; this line is a little to the south of that.

2754. Is not the southern portion much more thickly populated?—No, where this line comes is the thickest part of the whole lot.

2755. By the Chairman.—Thicker than towards Victoria-street?—This brings you right into the business part, and enables you to tap that part, and bring the people there and take them away.

The witness withdraws.

Adjourned to Tuesday next, at eleven o'clock.

TUESDAY, 10th NOVEMBER, 1896.

Members present:

Mr. Cameron, in the Chair;

Mr. Burton, Mr. Craven, Mr. Harris, Mr. J. S. White.

Francis Bonnans Clapp, sworn and examined.

2756. By the Chairman.—What are you?—Managing director of the Tramways and Omnibus Company.

2757. Some complication has arisen since we commenced this inquiry with reference to the interests of the Tramways Company, the Trust, and the municipalities, and we are anxious to get direct information as to the position of the trams and the municipalities. What relationship is there between the company and the Trust?—The Trust borrowed the money to construct the trams; the company leased the trams from the Trust, paying the interest that the Trust pays, amounting to 4½ per cent, per annum, and established a sinking fund by which, at the end of the lease, or prior to that time, the money will accumulate in that fund so as to pay off the money borrowed by the Trust in full, and the property will be handed over to the Trust free, without further cost—that is the permanent way and the engine-houses; the car-houses the company owns.

2758. The cars will still remain the property of the company?—Yes, the rolling-stock and the car-houses will still remain the property of the company. Our car factory, where we manufacture and repair the cars, belongs to the company also.

2759. Do they not hold that over?—No, unless it is purchased. There is no provision for buying it at all by the Trust.

2760. What is the total amount you have already paid the Trust?—We pay them £74,250 per annum for interest. We have paid since the beginning £549,523 15s. 6d. for interest. We pay for sinking fund £30,750 per annum. We have paid, with accumulations up to the 30th June, 1896, £535,015, but I believe since then there have been more accumulations, bringing it up to about £340,000. This money is invested by the Trust, and keeps accumulating all the time, and that goes to our credit.

2761. Do you pay anything else in the way of fees or rents, or dues that cover the whole that you have to pay?—We pay the expenses of the Trust. We guarantee to pay that expense up to £1,000 a year; it does not amount to quite that now.

2762. Have you, to lay out a fixed amount in repairs?—We pay licences—£3 a year for each car and each dummy—to the municipalities, and last year our rates amounted to £29,000, in round numbers. We are rated by the municipalities on the property. Then we pay to a renewal reserve. It does not go to the Trust directly, but we are bound by our lease to hand this property over to them in good order, fair
wear and tear excluded. In order to do that, our lenses being so long—32 years—there will have to be a renewal, and we make a renewal reserve for that. That reserve account has £150,003 13s. 4d. to its credit. That is put aside, as, by-and-by, there will be large expenses on account of renewing the permanent way, the rails, and the wooden blocks, which will be expensive work.

2763. Is the property to be valued when you relinquish it, or is there an inspection annually to see if you are keeping it in proper repair?—We keep it in repair to the satisfaction of the Trust; they have an officer who looks to that. There is no valuation at the end; we simply step out as you would step out of a tenement house.

2764. He is satisfied as you go on that you are doing justice to the property?—Yes.

2765. Have you any doubt about its continuing to pay, to be able to lay aside the necessary funds, such as interest, sinking fund, and rates, and the rest?—If business gets no worse than at present, I think we can continue to do so; we do so now, and pay 5 per cent. dividend. We consider that a very small dividend for a business of this nature, because the shareholders stand with us; there is no reserve for them to pay the value of their shares. They give us everything at the formation of the lease. We think that 5 per cent. dividend is a small dividend for an undertaking of that kind. There should be a dividend by which they can make a reserve for themselves and say—"We put by so much every year to recoup us at the end for giving it up for nothing."

2766. Is the 5 per cent. on the actual amount paid on each share?—Yes. There are 900,000 shares paid up to 10s.; we pay the 5 per cent. on the 10s.

2767. Are the earnings of the tramways increasing or decreasing?—There has been an improvement of late. I think this will be a better year than last; it shows so, so far.

2768. Have you any objection to tell us which is the best paying line of those tramways?—The one that carries the most passengers and is the best paying one is the Clifton Hill line—the Smith-street line.

2769. Is that increasing or stationary?—It is just taking its course with the others.

2770. The increase is general all over the lines?—Yes, as nearly as possible. I looked through the returns the other day to see how the increases were coming in, and along the line I could see a little increase, no one line more than another, apparently.

2771. With reference to the lines on the south side of the Yarra which have railways to compete against them, are they improving equally with the others?—There is a gradual increase on them all.

2772. Nothing astounding the competition of the railways?—Yes. I think if the railways have an increase, we get it in proportion. It shows there is more money with the public to spend for travelling.

2773. So far as your knowledge goes, the one does not rob the other; they keep in the same ratio whether they go down or up?—In the southern suburbs I notice that the railways are increasing and so are we.

2774. Three or four years ago the earnings fell off?—Very much.

2775. Both in railways and tramways?—Yes.

2776. The fact that they are both increasing now shows that one does not injure the other more than they did five or six years ago?—That depends upon the rates altogether. South of the Yarra we charge the same fares that we are allowed to by Parliament, with two exceptions that do not interfere with the railway. One is a little line down to the beach at South Melbourne right away from the railway. We charge there, on account of local competition, a lower fare; and the other is on the Esplanade line, which has a local traffic, and we charge a lower fare there. This, I consider, assists the railway, if anything, because people going by railway, and wanting to go to the Village Bellis, can get down now for 1½d., whereas formerly it was 3½d.

2777. You issue excursion fares, lately, from the extreme north to the extreme south?—We have what are called "beach" tickets, from the northern suburbs to St. Kilda and South Melbourne beaches; we do not issue them the other way. It is an excursion return to the beach. We do not issue them from the south to the north. It is a special traffic to the beach; if they choose to get off before they get to the beach they can do so, of course.

2778. Have you any fear that, if a railway were constructed in the northern suburbs, it would injure your tramways?—From the evidence that I have read in the papers, it is proposed to run them, if they are constructed, at a very much lower fare than the company charges. If that is the case, of course they would injure the trams; they would tend to reduce the revenue received from passengers by the trams.

2779. Why, if the railway were more convenient; you do not think they would go half-a-mile to the railway?—According to the evidence of experts that you have examined, they would travel three-quarter miles through three or four streets or a mile, and walk across three or four streets; there would be a general rush to that station. I think they would get, at a lower fare than the trams, a certain amount of traffic convenient to a station, people that wanted to come through to that part of the town—that is, the Hobson's Bay railway station or anywhere convenient to that station.

2780. That would injure you to a certain extent?—Yes; and the lower the fare the farther they would walk.

2781. Have you any idea which of those two lines that are now before the Committee would do the trams the least injury?—Either of them would injure the trams very much indeed if they were to run at a lower fare than the trams charge, and there is no doubt, from the evidence of the Traffic Manager, that that is the intention. If the trams reduced their fares to the same as the railway, the railway proposes to put them lower again; and, as he expresses it, the one that has the longest purse will survive. It seems to me there is going to be a very keen competition. According to his evidence he intends to get the traffic. We have undertaken those tramways and we must do our best to retain the traffic that we have or else we could not carry out our undertaking with the Trust.

2782. Supposing those two lines had been in existence at the time you started, do you think you would have constructed the northern suburban tramways?—I do not think we should have constructed so many of them.

2783. You would start the best paying one—the Clifton Hill one?—I do not know. It would depend upon the conditions, how the line was constructed, and the times. During the boom time perhaps we might have done. Everything looked as though it were going to pay, and we could not give them enough.
2784. We know that you started the trains on the southern side of the river while there were railways in existence; we want to know whether, in your opinion, if those two lines had existed—say one through Fitzroy and one through Collingwood—you would have started the and to Clifton Hill, Brunswick-street, and Nicholson-street? In regard to starting the trains on the south of the river, the position was this: We required the assistance of all the municipalities for the scheme, we thought, and it looked as though they would not support the scheme for post without the whole, because they recognised they were going to get a very great advantage; they were going to get a means of very easy and comfortable conveyance running along their streets, taking them from their very doors into the heart of the city. They had the railway, but the railways took them to one side, and they recognised that it was going to be a great improvement, and they wanted them. Another reason was, we were going to construct the lines in such a way as to pave and keep in repair 17 feet of the road, and save the municipalities doing that, the cost of which amounted to a large sum. Directly it was mooted that the municipalities should borrow the money and construct the trains, they all wanted to do it, and wanted more trains than we wanted to build. They wanted another train in Lygon-street, another in Latrobe-street, another through Collingwood and all through there—to assist us greatly, because we were not quite sure of our position with the southern districts. There is no doubt as a whole they are better than the southern lines.

2785. Are you prepared to say that you believed, at the time you got the Bill through Parliament, that they would never construct a line to the northern suburbs?—I say I do not think we should have constructed so many lines as we did; we would not have gone in for so many.

2786. I think it is a very great moment that your committee believes they would prevent the northern suburbs line being constructed for all time.—We did not give that much thought. What I thought was, that if those trains lines were constructed, the northern suburbs would not require a railway; they would be very well served with the tramways we were putting there, and I think so now. We have five lines there; those five lines are situated from 8 to 22 chains apart, so the passengers requiring to go to Melbourne, or to ride in any one of those trains, need not take longer than from one to about five minutes to get one. Take the lines 12 chains apart; divide that by two and it gives you 26 chains, that is about a quarter of a mile. That is far enough to walk to the tramway along the railway. There we have demonstrated it. There is a line of railway built parallel to our line, from the South Sands to the Mernda-road within 8 or 10 chains, a walk of two minutes; it could not be better situated to get the traffic along the South Suburbs where we get it. They have been running that railway for the last three years at a rate much lower than we charge, and getting their passengers to Melbourne in five minutes quicker than we do; yet the result is that we carry three to one that they do.

2787. That is to a great extent because they have a longer distance to go. You only calculate the distance to Spencer-street?—No. You say that is the essence of the contract, and those northern lines of railway are going to get the passengers and carry them to Melbourne quicker than the trains, and that will take the traffic. I say the railway delivers its passengers from Brunswick five minutes quicker than we do, and the trains carry three to the railway's one.

2788. But you get the benefit of those well-to-do people from the South Sands to the head of Elizabeth-street?—They can get into the train close to the South Sands.

2789. Not nearer the city than that?—You have the Royal Park station; also another station at the Flinders-street, and another at North Melbourne.

2790. There is no population there.—In the report evidence of the Traffic Manager I think he said one in three of the Preston and Collingwood people get out at Spencer-street. Whatever there are getting out at Spencer-street they have the advantage of getting to Spencer-street. We do not run them to Spencer-street, but if we did not get the traffic we might transfer them to any of our lines going to Spencer-street at Bourke-street, Colling- street, and Flinders-street; then they would get to Spencer-street. If there was a sharp opposition that is what we should have to do, but we hear on their own lines.

2791. I go on the trains from the Post Office to Brunswick. I find out that one-half, if not two-thirds, of the people who get in at the Post Office come out before they reach the South Sands?—We did not find that. It might have been so when you were going there, but for the morning and night traffic we have to the two ends for the opposite trams. The city traffic shows that line is divided between these lines. We have the North Melbourne line, the West Melbourne line, and the Brunswick line carrying the city traffic.

2792. How would you serve the large census population that come in by the Heidelberg and Preston lines?—If they were depending upon the trains they are well served now. If you ask how I should get them into the city that is another thing.

2793. Beyond the northern suburbs there is a population of 24,000 or 25,000 people who come in by these lines, and it is most inconvenient for people coming in from the country with a little luggage or some produce for sale. They are at disadvantages, because they cannot get into the centre of the city with their goods; your tram system does not serve them?—It serves them, but they have to change.
2794. They cannot carry the amount of goods that they want to bring.—No, but the expert evidence is that if these lines were built they would not propose to carry freight over them; they would consider the passenger traffic was all they could take.

2795. Then they would not serve those districts?—No. The freight now, I presume, goes round to Spencer-street.

2796. Not one-quarter of it; it is landed at other stations—Clifton Hill, Collingwood, North Fitzroy, and Carlton—and brought in vehicles from there, putting the people beyond to all that expense?—We, of course, could not do the freight business, nor would we pretend to.

2797. How would you do it by railway?—I should connect the Heidelberg line by about 50 chains, starting in about Plant-street, and connecting about Holden-street, Northcote; that would make a straight and direct line on to the Outer Circle line. That would make the line about 10 miles 60 chains all the way. Then I should expect them to run as fast on that line as they do on the Brighton line, which would take about 35 minutes to the Howson's Bay station from Heidelberg. You would have the Spencer-street station and the Howson's Bay station as well. The Spencer-street station is particularly valuable to people coming in who are going to the western part of the city, and also people who want to go to the races and the agricultural show. If you bring them into town, as you are proposing they would have to take another circuit to get out there. The reason I should do that would be because I am satisfied that either of those lines brought in through Collingwood or Fitzroy, and connecting with the trains, will have to compete at a rate that will not pay the railway, and it will take very considerably from the tramways and impel their position, and I do not even want to tell them. As the Heidelberg line does not pay, I do not think the country can afford to build another non-paying line at this particular time to take its passengers to Melbourne.

2798. You object to it on the ground that the country could not afford it?—And on the ground of our own country being injured by it. We have undertaken this great responsibility of paying £1,050,000 a year for interest and sinking fund, and putting by reserves to renew and keep in repair the works, and we must protect the company as far as we can; and, to do that, we have to take care of the traffic that we now have, and see that we do not lose any.

2799. If the country were to prosper for the next six years you would pocket the benefit of that prosperity?—We should benefit by that prosperity, no doubt.

2800. You would then return the State from earning this money. Although your concern belongs to a large number of people, it is not so much a State property as the railways, which belongs to every one in the country?—The tramways belong to a large number. The tramways of Fitzroy belong to the population of Fitzroy; they are the people's property; we are working for pestery. Having undertaken that responsibility, we shall do everything we can to keep the traffic. It would take some time, because we must exhaust our means so far as we could. We should call up our capital, mortgage our rolling-stock, and expend all our resources before embarking the undertaking; and, when we did, what would the tramways be worth to the municipalities? If we could not run them, what could the municipalities do? What has made me say that has been the evidence of your expert that "We will put our fares so and so: if the tramways come to that, we will go lower, and the longest purse wins."

2801. You think your purse is the longest?—No, but I think the population will patronize the tram in preference to walking to a railway station for a short journey.

2802. Yes. You seem to ignore altogether the influx it would be upon people who would have to travel 4 or 5 miles unnecessarily upon the railway?—No, it is not that, but it is a very comfortable and convenient way to get in if you are once in a train to go right on. If you cannot afford to build a line of railway that will cost over £200,000, do the next cheapest thing, build a short connecting link, and bring them in as quickly as you can.

2803. Allowing that that was done it would take them round more than 4 miles?—Yes.

2804. Those goods that are on the opposite side of the city to Spencer-street?—Those goods that are required on the opposite side of the city for Collingwood and Fitzroy are very conveniently situated to be carried to all these stations; you could get from the depot of Fitzroy and Collingwood, the same as they are now from Spencer-street.

2805. Twenty-four thousand or 25,000 people have a right to have a voice in having a better convenience than when they get within 4 or 5 miles of the city to have to carry their goods to the centre of the city?—I do not suppose they could get much nearer than the Fitzroy and Collingwood stations. I am speaking of the goods coming to Collingwood and Fitzroy.

2806. They come in to Melbourne?—I cannot understand why they should. They are in the freight firm, and why should they not be carried to Spencer-street? It is an anomaly for them to leave the train at Fitzroy and Collingwood and carry the goods down to King-street. I cannot understand that.

2807. By the Hon. D. Melville.—How many miles of tramway have you in Melbourne?—43 miles of cable tramways, double track. The reason we oppose the railway is that the railways are already there, and if you build the railway it will be a case of the Outer Circle railway again. I think the estimates you have are misleading; otherwise it is than so many of the lines built under those estimates have been failures. The district is well served by tramways, and why should you build a railway which cannot pay to compete with us.

2808. Even if you had to call upon your capital, it was you who attacked the railways in the first place—you were the aggressor?—In what way?

2809. The cost of the Howson's Bay line to the State was £1,388,753 exclusive of rolling-stock, and the other suburban lines have also cost large sums—all those lines were existing when you went into competition with them with your tram?—At the request of the municipalities.
2811. You say that the people wanted the tramways, if we show that the people want this 492 miles of railway, what do you say to that? I say we were taking the risk ourselves as a private company, but, in this case, the State takes the risk. In the case of a railway the State pays the fees, but we do not ask the State to do that.

2812. You have 43½ miles of tram lines, and there are 16½ miles of south suburban railways—but the country with your trams and the railways working together made a splendid development—has not every place where you put the tram lines moved forward by shops and boulards, as well as where there are railways? More with the trams than with the railway, as has been proved within the last few years. Since the cable roads and electricity have been adopted in America, it has been proved to the satisfaction of all railway men in the United States, and I think also in Canada and Great Britain, that a locomotive steam railway cannot successfully compete where the fare is similar with an electric railway or cable line, and the result is that they are paralleling the lines running out of the cities to the suburbs all through the United States, and Canada, competing against steam railroads already in existence, and taking the traffic from them. They are building no more steam railways for suburban traffic anywhere within a radius of from 5 to 10 miles of cities.

2813. Did you not understand and try to make the community believe that the trams would be feeders to the suburban railways when you proposed your Bill? I believe they are feeders to the suburban railways, I believe that we have increased the traffic of some of the lines to the south, by our lines. We bring them down from the town, and they get into the suburban railways.

2814. The 16½ miles of south suburban railways bringing in about £30,000 a year will send these 42 miles not maintain the average, in your opinion? I think they would if you had not to contend with the trams.

2815. We are contending with the trams now, and we get £3,000 a year out of it; will these 42 miles keep up the average of the suburban system?—As to competing with the trams on the southern lines, I consider there is no competition as to fees there whatever.

2816. On 164 miles of railway we get £20,000 per mile per annum?—The Brighton line is the only one on which we compete with the railways. Competition means the reduction of fares.

2817. Our south suburban lines bring us £20,000 per mile for the 16½ miles; so you think if we can increase the 42 miles we will still get £20,000 per mile?—I cannot see how you can. Where is the population to come from? According to the evidence given before you it will come from the traffic that is now being carried by the trams, and you will have to compete with the trams to get it, and I do not think you can successfully.

2818. The fact has been given in evidence that we get about £20,000 per mile from the south suburban lines. As a business man, knowing Fitzroy and Collingwood well, will we take £20,000 per mile from these lines?—I do not think so.

2819. What do you estimate it will be?—I cannot give an estimate, but I do not see how you will get that revenue out of them, because I look to what has been demonstrated at Brighton.

2820. You do not mean to say that the trams comply with all the conditions required by the general public?—They comply with all the conditions for suburban traffic. They do not carry freight on a suburban railway. All the freight goes by express waggonage.

2821. Do you mean that for Fitzroy and Collingwood the trams alone are absolutely fulfilling the conditions of life required by those people?—I think so.

2822. Then why is it not sufficient for St. Kilda, Toorak, Port Melbourne, and Williamstown?—Those railways have been built for a number of years, but if they were not there already there would not be one of them built, not even to Brighton. They would not go to the expense, and they certainly would not cut a district in two, as they did in South Melbourne, by a big cutting. People will not travel through tunnels and cuttings and on a high-level road when they can step off the street into the car.

2823. In Richmond, East Richmond, and Burlorey there is an average of 48 journeys per head of population by tram, and 115 journeys by rail?—There is no competition there. Our fares are higher than the railway fares. I suppose at Burlorey we are about 43 fares from the line, and I anticipate that we shall retain people for about half that distance, though perhaps we do not even do that as regards our fares being higher. The same applies to Port Melbourne. The line there runs parallel to our line.

2824. Taking Albert Park, the average number of journeys per head is 48 by rail and 57 by the tram—Can you explain that?—You forget that we are not going there: people get a 2nd class return to town for 3d., whereas the trains have to pay 3d. each way.

2825. Have you any reason to think that you have overdone the trams in any of the districts—that you have built more than was necessary?—I think we could do with more.

2826. If I say that the Brighton railway has doubled its income since 1865, what do you say to that?—I am not surprised in the least; they carried nobody before that—they did not pay for years. I am told what is the use of double the income on a railway if it does not pay? I do not think you can make a railway pay by charging Is. a month to Coburg or Moreland-road. Even then they do not get the traffic, because the people go by tram instead. They have been running for three years at reduced fares, and losing £14,000 a year.

2827. If that railway had been constructed straight into the city, what would have been the result?—A loss, if I brought our facts down—we have had experience of that.

2828. When you say you know who raised the railway to go straight line?—No.

2829. Was not it the Tramway Company—are you not aware that the contract was let for a line that touched the Sydney-end east of the Zoological Gardens, and some of the work was actually done before your company objected to the straight road?—I do not think we did.

2830. Who is Mr. Cain?—He is a director now.

2831. Was not he the Mayor of Melbourne then, and one of the directors of your company? He was Mayor of Melbourne; I do not think he was a director.
2832. Do you not remember the agitation on the part of the people to get a direct line, and your opposition to it?—I remember driving in the park one day, and seeing that it was cut in two. There was going to be a great cutting there, and there was an outcry about destroying the park. I think the late Mr. Woolas was the Minister of Railways at the time.

2833. The direct railway to Brunswick was impossible with the competition of the company at the time?—I do not remember it; I am not aware of it.

2834. You are aware that the journey was lengthened by going west of the Sydney-road, in place of getting its natural traffic—why was not the line allowed to take its natural course?—I have no idea, except that there was an outcry about cutting the park in two.

2835. Do you know how much money was lost by having to make that alteration?—No, but I should think it was a considerable amount.

2836. Is it not your experience that where railways and trams are running, whether in competition or not, a place such as Brunswick increases its population?—Certainly.

2837. If we succeed in adding 50 per cent. to the population in five years by this railway, what would you say to that?—I should ask where the people came from, or whether it was simply robbing the other suburbs, as was the case in Brunswick where we put the fares down.

2838. Suppose we do add 20 per cent. to the population of Fitzroy by constructing this line, would you still oppose it?—I doubt if I would do so, even with the cheap fares, unless by depopulating such places as Balmain, which is already pretty well depopulated.

2839. But suppose we do add to the population of Fitzroy, and the country beyond Fitzroy to the extent of 50 per cent, and we have therefore 50 per cent. more travellers, would you still oppose it?—I say, so far as Fitzroy and Collingwood are concerned, we could carry a good share of them if the line were built.

2840. Supposing by the agency of this railway we increase the population 50 per cent. in five years?—I should simply say it could not be done by a railway—you must have your population to do it with, otherwise you only take it from one side of the city to the other.

2841. But suppose it is done, what then?—I do not think it is a suspendable question. I say it cannot be done with our present population and the natural increase—the policy of the country seems to be that the population shall not increase from the outside.

2842. Brunswick has added 25 per cent. to its population during the last three years?—They come from the other suburbs.

2843. That is not the question—if Brunswick has added 25 per cent., cannot Fitzroy do it also?—I think Brunswick has exhausted the southern suburbs—Fitzroy and Collingwood are pretty thickly built on, but outside, towards Heidelberg, no doubt you would get a certain number of gentlemen who would have their villas there.

2844. Do you know anything in the known world that is equal to the tramway system in the last seven or eight years?—I do not know anything that pays better than your trams?—Yes, I should think the Oil Trust of New York paid better.

2845. But taking either railways or tramways, do you know anything that has paid better?—They have paid very well since we have had them, taking them as a whole—for the past four years they have paid 5 per cent.

2846. By Mr. J. S. White.—In 20 years the property goes to the municipalities—is there any fund to make up to the shareholders for the loss of their shares?—There is nothing put aside for that; we have no fund for the shareholders.

2847. By the Hon. D. Maloney.—You know nothing that has paid better all over the world than your trams have done from the start?—They have paid very well.

2848. Do you think that this 492 miles of railway justifies you in drawing the melancholy picture of the finish up of all the things that you have done?—The construction of one or both these lines will affect the fares on five lines of tramways, and perhaps six lines—if it was only one line it would be different, but you either parallel two lines, or you run across several lines.

2849. If it would work such a wonderful change, the railways must get the traffic?—Yes, but can it be got at a paying price? I am of the opinion that if a line is built to Fitzroy or Collingwood, the competition will force it to be very keen, and we might get traffic that would not pay, and so might the railway.

2850. Do you mean that this splendid concern would be killed by the construction of less than five miles of railway?—It will be affected very much, there is no doubt about that.

2851. How is it affected the railways must get the traffic?—Not necessarily, because if the fares on the tramways will be reduced in competition with the railway.

2852. Do you not think that there is room for both?—No, I do not; I think the districts of Collingwood and Fitzroy are well served.

2853. You would put a bar for ever against any railways being constructed in that direction?—I cannot bar them, I simply give my opinion, which is only one man's opinion.

2854. I understand that you wish to bar these railways—there is no time when you would ever think it proper for the Senate to build either of them?—I certainly think the present is a most inopportune time to talk of it, when the deficit last year was £500,000 or £600,000, and is likely to be as much this year.

2855. You have not shown that the deficit was on the suburban lines—£20,000 per mile on 1½ miles is rather a handsome income, the deficit does not arise from it?—You have the evidence taken before the Railway Board appointed to inquire into the railways generally, and that evidence, which has never been contradicted, is that the suburban railway system, taken as a whole, was losing from £25,000 to £50,000 per annum.

2856. Supposing your company earned £350,000 for 16½ miles, what would you think of it?—I would think that it was not worth much unless it was paying expenses—if we were losing £50,000 per year the company would go bankrupt in a very few years.

2857. Speaking as a business man, do you regard £20,000 per mile as a handsome return?—It seems a large sum, but if they are losing at the same time £25,000 per annum, there is no profit—there is no good in earning so much money, unless you are making money out of it—if we were running at a loss every year we could not pay the interest or sinking fund or any dividend whatever, on a ½ per cent. would have
to be reduced again: and instead of having respectable looking men, we should have the tug-mog and bobtail of the city—it would be a disgrace to see them.

2838. **By Mr. Burton.**—What is the total income of your company?—Our receipts for the year ending 30th June, 1896, were £333,017 7s. 11d. Those were the gross earnings.

2839. What are the total number of miles of tramway laid?—251 miles of cable lines.

2840. **By the Hon. R. Melville.**—Sixteen and a half miles of railway give £330,000 per year, while 143 miles of tramway give £355,000. In the face of that how can you say that the public prefer the trams?—There are some parts of that 143 miles that the trams do not come near at all, and the traffic is purely a railway one, such as Brighton, Camberwell, and so on, and in the parts where we do come in contact with them our fares are even higher than the railway fares.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to tomorrow, at half-past ten o'clock.

---

**Wednesday, 11th November, 1896.**

**Members present.**

Mr. Cameron, in the Chair; Mr. Burton; Mr. Craven; Mr. Harris; Mr. J. S. White.

**Mr. Cameron.**—I wish to correct a statement I made yesterday. In the first place I said the distance from Johnston-street along Holburt-street to Victorian-street was 34 chains; it is 41 chains. I also said that the cable lines were 98 miles; they are 44 ½ miles in length, horse lines 4 ½ miles, making 48 miles in all. The miles run last year was 80,053,997.

2851. **By the Hon. D. Melville.**—As to the statement you made about the paying nature of the suburban lines, I have a return from Judge Casey's Board. You said there was about £37,000 loss on the suburban system. That does not apply to the 16 miles only, but to the entire suburban system—Williams-town, Broadmeadows, Oakleigh, Ringwood, Kew, St. Albans, Somerston, Preston, Ferntree and Collingwood, Heidelberg, Glen Iris, St. Kilda, Camberwell, Port Melbourne, Brighton, and the rest. The total income from passengers only is £20,678, leaving a loss of £21,900; but if we add in to that the parcels traffic and goods traffic on those lines it brings it out enormously the other way—only quoted the loss stated on the suburban traffic, I did not know those particulars that you now give.

2852. The public idea is that we are losing on those suburban lines. We find that the gross takings of passengers only of £37,999, with the working expenses of £242,708, does bring out the £25,000 loss, but if you add the parcels and goods traffic you bring out an enormous profit. On the Brighton line alone it is £11,000 per annum for goods and parcels, and if you include ferro-clay you show that our suburban system is not a loss, but an absolute gain to the State—You so surprised that the officers allowed that statement to pass, because revenue from parcels is equally a revenue as from passenger, and as I understood it, as it was broadly stated that there was this loss, and it was not contradicted. The suburban traffic sought to greatly assist the losing lines in the country districts. If there is any profit on the railways it should be made on the suburban traffic.

2853. Can you state how many cars and grip cars the company have on which they pay a license fee of £3 each?—I cannot state the exact number that we run, but what we pay in licence would show that. We run a large number, and we have a considerable number that we do not run.

2854. **By Mr. J. S. White.**—You pay £3 for a dummy and £1 for a car.—Yes, £1 for each train.

2855. **By the Hon. D. Melville.**—You said, before the Railway Inquiry Board,—We have 19 ear houses, 232 grip cars, and 440 Rour cars—£72 cars all in all. We use 19 cars for the horse tramways, 18 cumulative, and 290 horses, and the number of employes is 416.—That was in 1895. The numbers have not materially changed.

2856. You do not pay this licence to the Trust; you pay it to the municipalities?—To the city of Melbourne.

2857. What is the annual value to the municipalities of the work the company perform in keeping the road in repair?—I cannot give that. Roughly, it is one-third of the streets that we run through.

2858. **What is the amount of the Trust had to build the tramways on which you pay 4½ per cent. ?—I believe it is £1,400,000.**

2859. What provision is made in the Act for the transfer to the Trust of the cars and ear houses which belong to the company, and who is to decide on their value at the finish?—There is no provision whatever for their transfer.

2870. They are your property without any provision in the Act?—Yes. The rolling-stock belongs to us. The car houses, the car factory, and our own offices belong to us; there is no provision whatever for their transfer.

2871. **By Mr. J. S. White.**—Supposing the municipalities do not require them at all, are they your property?—If they do require them they are our property. They are not bound to take them from us, and we are not bound to sell them. That is a matter of negotiation.

2872. **By the Hon. D. Melville.**—Parliament, next year, can deal with the reduction of fares!—Parliament may reduce the fares, but, after December, 1897.

2873. If Parliament should reduce the fares to 2d., or make 1d. section, and you were in opposition to that, in what way would you make your opposition known?—I presume Parliament would take it into consideration; and if we made representations to them that a certain fare would not pay, they would,
perhaps, take evidence as to whether it would, and would examine our books and see into our financial position. I do not imagine that Parliament would desire to impair the position of the company, or that they would, at the same time, desire to reduce the value of their own suburban railways by reducing the fares too much.

2874. The public have been looking forward to the time when there will possibly be a reduction: do you say that would impair the existence of the company?—We think 1d. a journey would. We do not think we have a population to warrant 1d. a journey.

2875. If the fares on the Coburg line were made universal, would you get more money?—I think the revenue would be less.

2876. If the fares were made 2d., all round, the revenue would be less?—I think so.

2877. Would you prefer 1d., or a 2d. fare?—I am hardly prepared to say at present. That would take some consideration. If Parliament should think it advisable to raise the fare, there are the conflicting interests of the State to be considered as to whether reducing the fares to 2d. would take from the traffic of the suburban lines.

2878. There is a specification about, and letters have been written to me about it, that the Tramway Company have influenced the shires and municipalities to take an interest in this matter. Those people say that all this opposition has arisen from the company starting the agitation against the co-operative societies. Have you done that?—I can say that we have not nothing to do in influencing the shires. I heard, incidentally, that letters were being sent from the shires. I think it was brought out here in evidence, but we had nothing to do with it.

2879. Then the rumour is incorrect?—We had nothing to do with it. I think the alarm first commenced with the Trust.

2880. You have not done anything to influence those local bodies?—No.

2881. By Mr. J. S. Blake—Can you tell in the number of trains running, and the accommodation supplied to the people of Fitzroy?—In Fitzroy and Collingwood we make 350 trips with tram cars per 1,000 of population; in Brunswick, 425; per 1,000Unity, Brunswick has 19,600 people. We make about 1,000 trips per day with the trains running through the districts of Fitzroy and Collingwood.

2882. You told us yesterday they went through the principal streets of the city?—They pass through north to south and east to west, and we transfer passengers free of charge from one train to another on the different line. For instance, passengers coming from North Carlton may transfer to Johnston-street line, and then they may go from there to Brunswick-street, and on through Smith-street for the same fare. From Clifton Hill they may go either through Smith-street or be transferred round through Carlton, and we transfer them through to Albion and so on, as we give every facility for people getting about inexpensively and conveniently.

2883. Do you think people will walk across Nicholson-street to go to a railway, and Johnstone-street, do you think they would cross the trains at Nicholson-street and Brunswick-street to get to a station at Young-street?—I am sure they would not if the fares were similar.

2884. If the fare was a little more than the railway, but the trains landed people at the Post Office instead of Flinders-street, which would they take?—I think they would take the tram. We have demonstrated on the Brunswick line that they will not walk for, though the tram runs faster when over the passengers are in it, considering the difference between walking to the station to get the train, the trains not running so frequently as the trains, and the passengers having to wait for the train, then being landed at the Holbton Bay station when they want to go to the Post Office or the Town Hall, the time saved would not warrant them in walking across our trains to the railway station. We have proved that they will not do it.

2885. How is it they do it in some instances—take Port Melbourne?—Port Melbourne is similarly situated to Brunswick; the tram runs parallel with the Port Melbourne tram line. We are charging there the full rate of fare that we are allowed to charge by our Act, that is, 3d. for a single fare. The railway charge is 3d. for a return ticket. We do not compete with the railway in our fares, therefore we do not take the traffic; the railway takes the most of the traffic on that line, but if we reduced the fares to the same extent we have reduced them on the Brunswick line, I have no doubt as to the result.

2886. Do you give transfers from the junction of Clarendon-street and the City-road to Port Melbourne?—We transfer at Clarendon-street from the Port Melbourne line to the South Melbourne beach, and from Flinders-street line to the Port Melbourne line at the shipping.

2887. Do you agree with the estimates that have been made of the traffic that those railway lines would get from you if they were built?—I do not agree that they will take traffic from us at a paying rate. If they reduced the fare they would take a good portion of our traffic, no doubt, but it will be at such a rate that it will be paying the railway, and we probably come up to lose money.

2888. That is to say, you will have to bring your fares down to compete with the railway?—We shall have to reduce our fares, and we shall not only reduce our fares, but we shall give further facilities for transferring passengers from the Johnston-street line to any of the three lines running west of Elizabeth-street to Spencer-street.

2889. I believe you have had a good deal of experience in this business?—I have had 40 years' experience in public traffic.

2890. What has been the result of railway competition in the United States?—I have had no experience in public traffic in the United States; all my experience has been here, both in country and suburban traffic, but in the United States since they have introduced the cable and electricity as motive power it has been proved to the satisfaction of all railway men there that, given similar facilities, the locomotive railway cannot compete successfully against a tramway for suburban traffic. Strange to say, while I was sitting here giving evidence yesterday a letter was delivered at my office from a friend of mine in New York, in which he says—"Our Brooklyn railway's been doing very badly for some time, owing to the trolley traffic (that is the electric car) coming into competition with us." This gentleman is a director of the railway company, and he keeps me well informed of what is going on. "So much has it affected our traffic that we have not even got the right to put the line into the hands of a receiver." I may say that on leaving here yesterday I went to our usual tramway meeting, and Mr. Cain was there, so I spoke to him about the deviation of the Brunswick line. He said he was Mayor of Melbourne at the time, and a deputation waited on him
with regard to the destruction of the Royal Park by making a deep cutting through it for the railway, and whatever he did was on account of that—the company had no hand in it whatever.

2891. *By the Hon. B. Mclvor.*—Is Mr. Cain a director of your company?—He is.

2892. *By Mr. J. S. White.*—Did Mr. Cain act as Mayor of Melbourne or as a director of the company?—As Mayor of Melbourne, in no way connected with the company.

2893. I believe you were connected with the old omnibus company?—Yes; I was one of the promoters.

2895. What became of the money you obtained for the sale of the plant and stock—was it put into the reserve fund, or did you pay any portion of it in bonuses to the bonus men?—We paid no portion of that in bonuses; we have not got rid of all the property yet. We had to stock the omnibuses, and we actually built a large building in North Fitzroy where many of them are now. We have sold a few to go to Western Australian and a few in country districts to run to and from the railway stations; we have broken up a large number of the old ones. We have sold some of the old omnibus houses and grounds, though we still have the South Melbourne one. The money went into the general business of the company; it all merged into the tramway business; we have written off good will at different times, and used the money generally in the business.

2896. Then the property of the Omnibus Company merged into the Tramway Company?—Yes. We did not form a new company to buy out the old company—the one company went right on, increasing the capital as it was necessary to develop the concern.

2897. Have your engineers ever calculated the saving to the municipalities owing to the company maintaining 16 feet of the streets for the whole 45 miles?—I cannot give an answer to that, but roughly it is one-third of the street that we have constructed and maintain. The result of that is that we not only save the municipalities the expense of keeping that portion in repair, but as our portion is very much superior to the portion outside, the traffic uses it, thus saving the municipalities many thousands of pounds in wear and tear on the roads at the sides of the lines.

2898. *By Mr. Craven.*—Was there ever a year in which you did not pay a dividend?—Never; we have always paid a dividend during the year; the lowest has been 5 per cent.

2899. Is that dividend based on the 18s. per share?—Yes.

2900. Do you know the cost per mile of working the tramways?—For operating the cars per car mile it is 2s. 6d.; the cost per train mile would be double that, or 5s. 6d. That was the cost for 1894, and for 1895 it is about the same.

2901. What you really fear is competition by the railway at lower rates?—Yes.

2902. If the lines were built and the rates kept up to the level of your own you would raise no objection?—No, we should have no fear whatever if the rates were the same as ours.

2903. If there were a better train service on the Brunswick line than there is at present would that affect the results?—Not materially. We have one concession to make here that we have not given yet—that is transferring the passengers from the Brunswick trains into the trains running to Spencer-street and vice versa.

2904. If you carried that into effect it would neutralise the effect of a more frequent train service?—I think it would. We are actuated by no spirit of opposition, but we must protect our property—we have got to protect the shareholders and the municipalities, and carry out what we have undertaken.

2905. There is a proposal by Mr. Milburn to connect with Spencer-street running along Lonsdale-street, with a station near the intersection of Elizabeth-street. If that scheme were carried out would it affect the evidence you have given?—I think not; we run very close to there, and people would have to cross one of our trains to get there. You cannot make a street railway of a locomotive railway. It would be an elevated railway, and the passengers would have to walk up to it and wait for the trains to do so, whereas every foot of a street that we run through is a station to it. We are actually street railways—the tramway was first given to the horse service, but we have got beyond that. We use a cable motive power, and the term given in the United States and Canada is street railway.

2906. Have you ever made any calculation as to whether you can carry a ton of live freight cheaper by a cable tram than by any other means of locomotion?—No, we have not compared it except with electricity—we have not had occasion to compare it with a railway. We are quite satisfied as to our ability to compete with a mile or two for short distances.

2907. How does it compare with electricity?—The cost of our operations shows less than electricity. In Chicago the cost of operating the electric lines for 1895 was nearly 5 cents, or 2s. 1d. per mile more than for the cable trains. That information is taken from the Railway World, of March, 1896.

The witness withdrew.

John McGregor, sworn and examined.

2908. *By the Chairman.*—What are you?—A civil engineer, residing in Melbourne. I have been practising in Melbourne for the past ten or seven years, but I was born here many years ago. I have been practising my profession for the last 25 years in the Australasian colonies, carrying out various works.

2909. *You have some new scheme to submit to the Committee?—[The witness produced a plan, and read the following paper:—]"

**Proposed Princess-Bridge connection for Whittlesea and Heidelberg Railways.**

**Description of Railway.**

1. The title, "Northern Suburban Railway Lines," should be abandoned, because it is misleading.
2. The system should be "Princes' bridge connection for Whittlesea and Heidelberg Railways."
3. The chief objects aimed at in this design are (first) to connect the Whittlesea and Heidelberg Railways at a suitable junction in the neighborhood of Murrall Creek, and (second) to run the shortest possible connection to Princess's bridge station.
4. What are usually called the "vital routes" (Fitzy and Collingwood), as laid down by the Railway Department and previous Committees, are so distinctly different in character that the construction of one or both has been blocked for years by a conjecture of the purposes of each, and the special objections for which the lines should be constructed if authorised by Parliament.

The "Collingwood" line, as proposed by the Railway Department, is mainly a suburban branch, serving its own district and is to be roughly located between Heidelberg and the new flying-field. The expected expediency of constructing such a line should rest on its prospects of providing sufficient passenger traffic to make it a paying line on the same principle as some of the other suburban lines, say St. Kilda or the new line that runs to a short end.

The short connecting link so urgently required for the country railways (namely, Whittlesea and Heidelberg lines) should not be cancelled now, as Collingwood and Richmond to Prince's Bridge stations.

3. The accompanying plan shows two alternative routes by which the object in view may be accomplished, but one connection only is proposed to be constructed, and for simplicity and convenience the proposed alterations and new lines will be followed towards from Northcote to Prince's Bridge station.

The line marked red on our plan starts with a 2000 rod short loop from the Northcote stations, crossing the Merri Creek on separate bridges linking up the Whittlesea and Heidelberg lines at a new junction station on the south side of Merri Creek. From this station two lines of railway are carried right through to Prince's Bridge station, being separate and down lines.

The new junction, then, the lines are run under Palmeira Street in two separate tunnels in what is known as "cut and cover section," to a new station at Alfred Crescent.

This line follows the present Flower street coupler in open cutting to the main Heidelberg-road, and then passes under the road to Napier Street station in cut and cover tunnels again.

The electric locomotive engines will then arrive at the station and the line is carried in two separate tunnels driven under Napier Street and Lansdowne Street to the northeastern corner of the Treasury Gardens; thence under the gardens to the intersection of Spring and Flinders streets, when the tunnels end, and the lines come out into the open and run into Prince's Bridge station, the total length from the new Merri Creek Junction station to Prince's Bridge being 2 miles 35 chains.

The blue line starts from Northcote station with a new loop crossing Merri Creek as a bridge, and linking to the Whittlesea and Heidelberg lines at the present Clifton Hill station.

The double line is then carried along the present Collingwood corridor to Napier Street, thence in open cutting on a falling grade to Clifton Hill station, where the two separate tunnels start and are driven through the line to Lansdowne Street; thence following the same route to the intersection of Spring and Flinders streets as the red line, and into Prince's Bridge station, the total length from the junction station at Napier Street to the corner of Peel and Chambers streets, because it is a favorable position for gathering and distributing passengers, but the question of housing passenger stations close in to the central city station on any southern railway is one that should not be too strongly urged at present.

In our case the tunnels will only be about half the length on either route.

The electric locomotive engines will then arrive at the station and the line is carried in two separate tunnels driven under Napier Street and Lansdowne Street to the northeastern corner of the Treasury Gardens; thence under the gardens to the intersection of Spring and Flinders streets, when the tunnels end, and the lines come out into the open and run into Prince's Bridge station, the total length from the new Merri Creek Junction station to Prince's Bridge being 2 miles 35 chains.

The blue line starts from Northcote station with a new loop crossing Merri Creek as a bridge, and linking to the Whittlesea and Heidelberg lines at the present Clifton Hill station.

The double line is then carried along the present Collingwood corridor to Napier Street, thence in open cutting on a falling grade to Clifton Hill station, where the two separate tunnels start and are driven through the line to Lansdowne Street; thence following the same route to the intersection of Spring and Flinders streets as the red line, and into Prince's Bridge station, the total length from the junction station at Napier Street to the corner of Peel and Chambers streets, because it is a favorable position for gathering and distributing passengers, but the question of housing passenger stations close in to the central city station on any southern railway is one that should not be too strongly urged at present.

When the population demands it, lift stations similar to the City and South London, can be placed at favorable positions along the line of tunnels by the acquisition of a small area of land on the surface of 25 feet diameter.

The first object should be to make the shortest possible connection from the central city station to the two country lines; this accomplished, the traffic will follow.

Referring to the ever increasing difficulties of constructing surface railways through densely populated cities, the late Mr. Greathead, engineer to the City and South London Railway Company made the following observations—"It may be stated generally that where the need of communication is most pressing, the making of railways in the ordinary manner is most difficult and costly, and is attended with loss and inconvenience to the inhabitants. The ceaseless activity which makes the railways so desirable cannot bear interference insurmountable from their construction."

The railway and electric locomotive solve the difficulty, and there could scarcely be a more suitable case for their application than the extension of Melbourne and its southern suburbs.

When we notice that the Railway Department estimates include sums of £80,000 and £90,000 respectively for land compensation for about 2 miles of railway—and that are, after all, only estimates of land compensation—it is no wonder the money is not driven to construct what some propose, and even if it be done to construct it, that any new plan or invention is not put on its new foundation of material and instead of putting it into the pockets of a few property owners. The railway is preferred, and land prices are the property of the railway company. Under consideration is the clause in the Railways Act requiring districts to be defined that would be liable to pay interest at the rate of 4 per cent. on capital expended on land taken for an ordinary surface railway.

The difficulty of getting the requisite majority of ratepayers to consent to this obligation is almost inapplicable, whereas by the adoption of a tunnel scheme such a guarantee is required.

The lowest estimate was £12 5s 0d. per rail. With the present grade of flat road, running grades of 1 in 80 are ordinary in a direct line to the northern suburbs but can be constructed without a tunnel at least half a mile long, and when that is the case it is better to have the longer grade of 1 in 80 at once and get the flaw done in one of 40, with all its accompanying advantages of increased carrying capacity and lower working expenses.

By the adoption of either the red or blue lines for connecting the Whittlesea and Heidelberg railways to Prince's Bridge station, the present coupler lines to Fitzroy and Collingwood are left untouched, and can be used as goods sidings in the same way that they are now, retaining their connection with all the old lines.

The red line shows on plan with three new stations is estimated to cost £265,000. The blue line with one new station, and Collingwood station re-established, is estimated to cost £200,000.

At an engineering point of view, one line is just as easy to construct as the other, the difference in cost—namely, £45,000—being accounted for by the longer tunnels, the two loops crossing Merri Creek, and an important new junction station there on the red line.

The important questions to answer—Which will be the best line for the public? So far as the Whittlesea and Heidelberg railways are concerned, it can make no difference after a junction of both lines is effected at the Merri Creek or Clifton Hill stations. The distance towards to Prince's Bridge station is practically the same on either line; the question then is narrowed down to sorting the greatest number of passengers from the junction station towards.

The junction is not made clear to the greatest number of passengers from the junction station towards. Were it not for the existing cable tram service, the Napier Street line would certainly carry the largest number of passengers to the north, but this is a line that should not be ignored while endeavouring to make the long route for the construction of a new northern suburban railway.

The lines now proposed, however, only touch the outer fringes of town traffic, which the cable system should be left alone from the first.

As mentioned in my letter of the 2nd inst., I am prepared to construct the red line for £245,000, and the blue line for £200,000, and undertake to hand over the railway in complete working order within a period of 24 months from date of commencement.

The lowest departmental estimates already submitted for the proposed Fitzroy and Collingwood lines separately appear to be £247,000 and £237,185 respectively. My estimate for the blue line through Collingwood station is £257,000 less, and for the red, Napier Street only £150 000 less; but I have the idea of an important new junction station at Merri Creek in my estimate that is not included in the departmental estimate.
2910. Your blue line after you leave Johnson-street goes in a straight line in an angular way to a vist street—Napier-street.

2911. By the hon. B. McElvile.—That is a very narrow street—A clone wide, I think; it is not a business street. George-street would do as well, but it is not quite as straight.

2912. By the Chairman.—Would you advocate building the two lines?—Certainly not. One is quite sufficient to draw the traffic from the country lines into the city. I would have a double line of rails.

2913. Which of the two do you think will be the best?—There is a difference of £15,000 in the cost.

2914. Which would earn the most money?—So far as the country lines are concerned, I propose to junction them both at the Merri Creek. It is not only inward that you would gather traffic. I think the red line best from an engineering point of view; that is what you call the Fitzroy line, but it would cost £25,000 more.

2915. If it brings £55,000 more a year, that would compensate for that?—Yes; but the difference in earning power would not be so very great.

2916. What is the length of the tunnel on that line?—A mile and a half on each line.

2917. The junction station south of the Merri Creek would be an addition. Supposing you came on the Hobson-street line to Collingwood, it would be an addition to the Clifton Hill station?—Yes; you would not join the Clifton Hill station at all. Then, you would come round by the loop north of Merri Creek on the red line. On the blue line the Clifton Hill station would be the junction station. That is one of the items that accounts for the difference in cost, and having to have two crossovers over the creek. The present bridge is very expensive in consequence of the high elevation.

2918. You loop into the present Fitzroy caskip?—I run side by side by it, but not on the rails.

2919. Would you use the rails?—No, I would leave them as they are; they would be very useful for country siding.

2920. Would you alter the grade between Clifton Hill and Reilly-street?—No, I would start at Reilly-street.

2921. How much are you below the department estimate?—£37,000 with the blue line.

2922. Supposing it is imperatively to construct the two lines, would that alter your plan?—Not the slightest, but I think it would be a waste of capital.

2923. Supposing it was agreed to construct them both, would you run those two lines as close together as marked on the plan by you?—My views about Collingwood are very different from what I see are held by most men. If I had to make a railway to Collingwood I should make it run to a dead end as a suburban line, and nothing more, but to use it as a through line to join up Heidelberg and Whittlesea would be very unsuitable.

2924. The one line would not be used for both Heidelberg and Whittlesea?—Not according to departmental proposals.

2925. The present agitation is for a line coming from Heidelberg, Fairfield Park, Clifton Hill, and Collingwood to be continued to Princes-bridge, and the other coming from Preston, Whittlesea, and Northcote by a caskip up Young-street; so that if the two lines were constructed there would be no loop to connect them at the Merri Creek?—No, you would have to make a curve going round from Scotchman-street to join the other line. That is a very expensive piece of work as proposed by the Department. They estimate it to cost £25,000, and there are only 30 chains of it. It must be for purchasing buildings or land. The mere laying the permanent way would not cost very much.

2926. You require a loop also to get alongside the Fitzroy caskip?—No, I run up under Faraday-street, and put a new station at the end of Faraday-street, which is the proper gathering ground.

2927. You do not think a good junction station, or passenger station of any kind, can be get at Northcote; it is not in a good position—is it on the wrong side of the river.

2928. If the Fitzroy line is adopted and the loop from the Heidelberg line, it would start north of Northcote South and join the Preston line without a station except the present station?—Yes; I looked at that line, but I think the other is very much better.

2929. What is your valuation of the property?—I do not take my property at all. I start at the corner of Spring and Finleys streets, and pass under the gardens. I do not even touch the surface of the gardens.

2930. You would have to pass through the Treasury Gardens?—Yes, but I would not touch the surface. The line would go underneath and come out at the corner of Landseer-street, I would commence the tunnel outside Flinders-street.

2931. How much would you be below the surface at the entrance?—Twenty feet at rail level; 3 or 4 feet above the crown of tunnel is quite sufficient.

2932. Would your level be as much as that?—Yes. The present line is 20 feet above datum level, and you get 50 feet at the crossing of Spring and Finleys streets.

2933. At the north end of the tunnel where do you come on the level?—I never touch the open until I come to cross the Heidelberg-road, but I have placed a station on the flat in Napier-street, where the passengers could walk down. The platform would be about 15 feet below the surface. They would walk down into the sidings and get into the train in the usual way.

2934. Would it be a subterranean railway all the way from the junction of the Merri Creek until you get to the Redland line?—Less the portion following the Fitzroy caskip, going through the gardens and down to the Heidelberg road; that is an open cutting, but the balance is really a subway.

2935. What is the length of the tunnel?—A mile and a half to the first station. The whole length of the line is 2066. There is 36 chains of open cutting.

2936. By the hon. B. McElvile.—Have you ever done any work of a similar character to this?—Yes, I have just finished one of the most difficult tunnels that have ever been constructed in Australia in conjunction with the government works. We had to use seven long shields in very bad ground. It starts from the Yarra River and goes to Port Melbourne, 6,000 feet.

2937. How does your estimate compare with the estimate of the tunnel work of the Government?—I have not seen any special item set against the tunnel, it is a lump sum for one or both lines.

Northern suburbs.
2907. What is your tunnel? - It is chiefly lined with bluestone blocks. I have used some concrete blocks, but I do not approve of them; I would not use them again. If I came across soft ground I would line it with iron, but when the ground is good it is usual to line a tunnel with stone or brick. I think this ground is all fairly good.

2908. Do you estimate it all through alike? - During the last three years the firm with whom I have been associated have tendered for every tunnel and every large work that has been advertised in connexion with the Metropolitan Board of Works. We have also tendered for every important work in the Australian colonies, from Western Australia to Queensland, and I am very familiar with estimates.

2909. Suppose we had to authorize two lines, and were to adopt your two lines, what would the length be? - My design is not for two lines at all.

2910. What is the length of the Fitzroy line? - About 25 miles.

2911. Where do you come out of the tunnel? - About Westgarth-street, about a mile and a half from Prince's-bridge. I would have no station to begin with until I get there.

2912. This idea is not to cap Fitzroy at all; it goes up to the end of Fitzroy. - That is a very good place for one of the stations.

2913. You do not propose to carry passengers from the centre of Fitzroy to Melbourne? - If they chose to come to the station I would.

2914. The Government proposal is to have stations at Gray-street, Johnston-street, and Gérard-street; you ignore all these stations? - I do. You had better leave that now to the Tramway Company.

2915. This proposal is merely for the people at the north end of Fitzroy; it is not an interior affair at all. - That is the chief object of it, but I think it would gather traffic as the population increased.

2916. Could you have stations along the tunnel? - Yes, all along the line if necessary.

2917. How do you ventilate the tunnel? - A single tunnel will almost ventilate itself; the difficulty arises when trains must meet each other.


2919. Do you not see any difficulty in this? - The people in Fitzroy are aspiring for a railway with three stations! - I have got three stations there; that will suit the north end of Fitzroy very well.

2920. By the Chairman. - You do ignore all the population between Johnston-street and Prince's-bridge?

2921. Yes, at present; but if they want the services you could put a station at the junction of any street, say half-a-mile apart; it is very simple with lifts for passengers.

2922. By the Hon. D. Melville. - How deep would they have to descend to make stations? - About 30 to 40 feet.

2923. By the Chairman. - You know Gérard-street; how many feet would it be under the Gérard-street level? - About 30 feet; it is on the crown of the hill.

2924. By the Hon. D. Melville. - The other peculiarity is that you arrive at the same cost as the Government on that line, and you say no property? - Certainly, tunnels are more expensive than surface formation, and I have no important new junction station at Merri Creek included in my estimate.

2925. Would you call for tenders for this work? - No, I would do it myself, or I am perfectly willing that it shall go to public competition, and then tender for it.

2926. You would not recommend us to accept your proposal to build this railway? - I do not think you would get such a good offer from anybody else.

2927. By the Chairman. - Are you competent to carry out that without interference by the Government officials at all? - Yes, I would comply with the usual conditions of deposit on railway contracts.

2928. It would be done on your plans? - Yes, or you could get the railway officials to prepare the plans and submit them to public competition.

2929. By the Hon. D. Melville. - If you are told that two sets of rails will never do this traffic, that they must have four sets of rails, what do you say to that? Mr. Spright, Mr. Renick, and other experts have said that? - I can only say that in London over a 4ft. 8in. gauge, last year they carried through 3/4 miles of tunnels 7,000,000 of passengers, on an up-and-down line, and they were prepared to carry 14,000,000 if they could get them.

2930. By the Chairman. - Why not have a single tunnel for both lines? - It is more expensive and more difficult to construct. You want more head-room for it; two single tunnels are cheaper than one to carry a double line, and it is better for ventilation.

2931. If you were given this contract, and you were given the choice whether you would have single tunnels or a double tunnel, you would prefer the single tunnels? - Of course, I could not tell you the exact difference in cost now, but it is a well-known fact that the large double tunnel is more expensive. You have to make it about 25 feet in diameter. - [The witness read the following extract from Mr. Greenough's description of the City and South London railway.]

**SEPARATE TUNNELS FOR UP-AND-DOWN LINES.**

The advantages of two tunnels instead of one as regards ventilation are dealt with later in the paper. The other considerations which weighed in favour of separate tunnels may be summarized thus:

1. They could be constructed where a single double-line tunnel could not be, as, for instance, under Swan-street, Upper-Beaconsfield. In this locality the value of property is very great, and it is impossible to estimate the saving effected by the adoption of two separate tunnels here, the lane being little wider than a single-line tunnel.

2. The lines could be placed at different levels at the stations for convenience of access, as at those of the stations on the railway.

3. Where junctions are intended or may be required at a future time the placing of the lines at different levels enables a junction without a level crossing to be made without the cost of extensive "fly-over lines."

4. A dip could be given to the lines as carried out on this railway to some extent between the stations for obtaining a higher speed or lower cost of working or both, maintaining the gradients against the load, that is to say, approaching the stations at each a moderate inclination that trust could always ascend them, while giving to the gradient with the load, that is to say, on leaving the stations, such a steepness as to secure rapid acceleration. The approaching gradients are 1 in 100, and the departing gradients 1 in 30.

5. If both lines had been in one tunnel, the gradients with and against the load would necessarily have been the same.
(a) Greater safety in construction is secured where the tunnel is of little more than half the cross sectional area of reasonable line tunnel.

(b) The two tunnels are cheaper than one, and involve less cutting; and diagnosis of excavated material, a matter of importance in a great city not only to the constructor, but possibly to the local authorities and to the public.

(c) As an elementary principle it would seem to be better to bring all passengers quite near to the surface, and that, too, close, at the earliest possible point when the metropolitan underground railways were laid out, but even on those lines the platforms are often a considerable depth below the street level, and the ascents and descents of 30 or 60 steps was to be encountered. In 1888, when the proposal was made to raise and lower the passengers by lifts on the City and South London Railway, the Messrs. Collett's lifts had not yet been constructed, and it was expected that the completion of the project that the 92 lifts formed a serious objection.

Even since the opening and working of both of these railways it has been argued against the extension of the system, both in this country and abroad, that the necessity of employing lifts outweighs all other advantages of the deep tunnel system.

A century examination, however, should suffice to show that these objections are ill-founded. By the use of lifts in London the construction of the line embodies all the wires and pipes, and in the London clay, is rendered practicable. The cost of constructing railways near the surface, even if the obstruction of traffic could be permitted, would be much greater. Having regard to the necessity of overlapping buildings, diverting and reconstructing streets, wires, etc., and in general the inconvenience of excavation, there is no advantage.

The deep tunnels insure against injurious vibration and noise.

The cost of working the lifts is small compared with their convenience, and with the extra cost of other objections to the construction of railways near the surface, including in many cases the cost of erecting buildings on top of the street, the cost of the valuable establishments on the platforms above the street, as at Baker Street and Great Portland Street on the metropolitan and other railways in London.

The public do not object to lifts, as has been asserted by opponents, but on the contrary would have satisfaction in their installation at many of the stations on the metropolitan and other railways in London.

There are two lifts in the 25-ft. shaft at each station, of depths varying between 46 ft at Stockwell, and 47 ft at King William Street. The cages are approximately semi-circular in plan, and each accommodates between 50 and 60 passengers, who enter and emerge at either end. The lifts worked quite independently of one another.

Conclusion.—One object in placing the underground lines in separate tunnels was to remove vibration by the action of the trains.

When trains pass at a few in the same tunnel their action in entering the air in the tunnel is comparatively slight under frequent passages of short length between the outer air and the tunnel which provided. Any considerable transverse section of the tunnels, made for a short distance in front of and behind the train, leaves the great importance of wind has been called the "low boxes" on the metropolitan railways. Where, as on the other hand, separate tunnels are provided without an escape for the air, except through the stations and their passages, the drafts of air on the approach and departure of trains having a crossing large in proportion to that of the tunnel became increased, to the danger of discomfort, while the resistance offered by the air to the movement of the train is considerably.

The tunnels, both in and out of the stations, are to be selected by placing opposite sides of the stations at the most suitable and convenient for the platform stations. Each can be avoided by placing connecting passages between the tunnels, capable of being enlarged or reduced for regularity through the trains. This expedient was adopted on the City and South London Railway, and with quite satisfactory results, because in the absence of these locomotives it is not necessary to renew a large quantity of air on the passage of each train. Sufficient provision must in such cases be made for each station for the successive outward and inward air of the stations without change.

The deep tunnels of the railways give considerable climatic advantages. From observations taken on a hot day in summer and a cold day in winter, with surface temperatures of 83°F. and 62°F. respectively, the temperatures in the small tunnels were about 60°F. and 59°F. in the stations platform 68°F. and 59°F. and in the first coach of a train 62°F. and 57°F. respectively. In foggy weather the atmosphere below is comparatively clear, never exceeding a slight haze, even during dense fog on the surface.

Workings.—In Table I. of the appendices are given the results of the four complete years' working of the railway since its opening.

It will be observed that during that period the train mileage has increased from 174,435 in the first half-year to 289,801 in the second half-year, the locomotive expenses having been reduced by 41½ per cent. to the latter.

In other words, the locomotive expenses per train mile have been reduced from 9d. in the latter.

Up to December 31st, 1884, the electric locomotive of Messrs. Siemens Bros., and others, 76,000 miles. There had been so few failures in the machinery, the repairs had been in the main insignificant, and the wire gauge incident had run for eight months without change.

1865. How long will the people lie in the tunnel altogether?—Two or three minutes. My idea is that you could run in the junction station in about seven minutes or less; there is a certain length in the open cutting. It is only 14 miles. The train goes to Windsor in seven minutes, which is much longer.

2865. How far do you get the people to face the tunnel, you would get all the trade?—The people will face the tunnel.

2866. By Mr. J. S. White.—Is it your opinion that the traffic between the Collingwood line and Melbourne will come by railway or by tram?—I am inclined to think the people will go by tram; I think it is not fair to place them in a non-paying position. It is a pretty well-known fact that a tram service is only suitable for the definite length of the centre. It is better to be confined to short lengths.

2867. By the Chairman.—Supposing when you were running near the end of the tunnel, and you came within a few feet of the surface, you came in contact with a deep cellar 30 or 16 feet deep, what would you do?—On the red line there are no cellars; it is running under a street all the way and under the gardens. The other line is placed out of avoiding buildings. From the junction of Peel Street there are no buildings until you get to Collingwood, that is, of any consequence; there are a few wooden situations.

2868. By the Hon. D. McVicar.—You give up the tram trunk altogether: what reason have you for contracting that railway for the people beyond?—There is such a distant district that wants to be brought into a central station instead of sending them round by Spencer-street.

2869. If you had a solid reason for the construction of this railway line on the basis of the people that are away to the north of your first station?—I think so, taking all that immense district beyond.

2870. That will apply to the Department proposals as well as years?—I suppose so.

2871. Your evidence is strongly corroborative of one or either of these lines?—Decidedly; there should be one connecting link for those country lines.

2872. By Mr. Curren.—Would you bring goods in?—Yes.

2873. You would bring in the same rolling-stock worked by electricity?—Yes.

2874. If a truck were loaded with fruit you would simply attach your motor and bring it in without any shipping the fruit?—Exactly.

2875. As regards to the tunnel passed on the Collingwood and Fitzroy lines by the Railway Department do you think the nuisance of these tunnels would be very damaging to the lines being used by the public?—There is no great objection for a distance of half-a-mile, though it is not pleasant. I have often gone through long tunnels myself.
2973. No one takes notice of a tunnel on a country line, but in these tunnels people would be passing backwards and forwards every day!—There is a long tunnel from Port Lytton to Cloncurry, constructed many years ago. It is by no means pleasant to go through it.

2974. Are there any other schemes in London underground that are not run by electricity?—Yes; they work some of them by cable, and they are going to work them in Glasgow by cable. I do not think there are any worked by steam.

2975. Have you ever heard it stated that thousands of people in London refused to travel underground on account of the sulphurous fumes?—I know there is a very serious objection to long tunnels worked by steam locomotives. I do not think it is pleasant to go through a long tunnel with a steam locomotive.

2976. The chief point in your scheme is that it would be used because you use electric motors?—Yes; I would not advocated a long tunnel with steam locomotives.

The witness withdrew.

Adjour ned to Tuesday next, at eleven o'clock.

TUESDAY, 17th NOVEMBER, 1896.

Members present:

Mr. Cameron, in the Chair;

Mr. Burton,
Mr. Craven,
Mr. Harris,
Mr. Trewhill,
Mr. J. S. White.

Patrick Walter Millan, sworn and examined.

2977. By the Chairman.—What are you?—A public officer in the Lands Department. I am a draughtsman and surveyor employed in the in-door work.

2978. You gave evidence before a former Committee on this question?—Yes.

2979. Have you anything to add to what you said then?—Yes. At that time I simply gave a plan, believing that it would carry conviction on the face of it. Since then, I have collected some facts on the subject.—[The witness reads the following paper:—]

The Chairman and the Members of the
Parliamentary Standing Committee on Railways.

GENTLEMEN,

I beg most respectfully to submit my direct and central railway scheme for your consideration.

The scheme proposed by me for connecting the Northern Suburban Railway with the centre of Melbourne and the existing lines at Spencer street is a national as well as commercial one. It will pay the interest on the whole of the capital invested out of the funds now being on, and I will turn a non-paying line into a first-class paying one, and let me ask, what more do you want?

I will be able to show to you and the public, through the favour and assistance of the press, that these north suburban lines should be connected with the centre of the city at once and on the routes I have laid down.

I have given the matter a lot of time and consideration, and I honestly believe no man in Melbourne has spent so much time, labour, and thought on this subject as I have, off and on, for nearly twenty years past.

In 1877 I laid down a complete railway scheme for Melbourne and suburbs, and it is a national loss that it was not carried out; the loss, amounting to hundreds of thousands pounds, as the railway history of the past twenty years clearly proves.

During the years between 1875 and 1887 I explained my ideas to some of the leading men of that time; they approved of them and requested me to send them in to the Railway Department. I then told them that I thought it would be a waste of labour and time for me to do so, because I believed that the Engineer-in-Chief would not sacrifice himself and his staff by adopting my scheme or the plans of any outside person, no matter how superior the plans might be to their own. However, I gave way, and sent in my first plan to the Railway Department in 1875, through the then Minister of Lands, the Hon. J. G. Casey (now Judge Casey).

The late Premier, Mr. R. J. Paterson, thought very highly of my scheme and introduced me to Mr. Syme and strongly supported my scheme; it appeared in the press, and was highly approved of by the press and public men at the time.

The Oakleigh connection was the main problem at the time, and the purchasing of the H. B. Railway by the Government settled the Oakleigh connection, and my scheme was put up or dropped for a time. I might here state that Mr. Higginbotham (the then Engineer-in-Chief) report on my scheme was that:—We are not yet ripe for such a scheme as that proposed by Mr. Millan, but if, or a modification of it, must come some day. The time has now come, and no unnecessary time should be lost in constructing and carrying out my scheme.

When the Outer Circle line was proposed I fought hard against its construction, and pointed out, time after time, that it would be a failure, but the landowners, who were to receive substantial compensation out of the public purse carried the day; these are the people who gained by the construction of this Outer Circle—they took out of the public purse about £250,000 in a free, easy, and accessible manner.

The scheme consists of a main trunk line passing through the centre of Melbourne and connecting our eastern and western system of railways as follows:

Commencing at the existing lines near the west end of Lonsdale Street; thence through the centre of that street at the Model School; thence branching off to Collingwood, Carlton, and Fitzroy.

The Collingwood line goes through the centre of Victoria-park (this street is 3 chains wide, and the centre chain is fenced off in small enclosures) until Hoddle-street is nearly reached; thence curving northward into Hoddle-street and continuing it, crossing over Johnston-street; thence curving easily into the station yard at Collingwood.

The Carlton and Fitzroy line branches off from the main line at the Model School; thence north-east along the eastern side of the Carlton Gardens to the north-east angle of these gardens; thence curving into the centre of Nicholson-street and continuing northward over the tram rails; thence curving along Queen's Parade into the present lines in North Fitzroy station at Queen's Parade. (These parades are 3 chains wide.)

The lines along the routes described will be made partly on the cleared system and partly in covered and open cuttings, thus providing the ordinary street traffic, the tram, and other traffic will pass under and over the lines.

The line will be constructed in the following manner—Commencing at the existing lines at Spencer Street near the end of Lonsdale Street; thence passing under Spencer, King, William, and Queen streets in a covered cutting of about
573 chains long; thence an open cutting about 13 chains; thence a steel viaduct supported on steel columns, across 46 chains, passing over Elizabeth, Swanston, Ricketson, and Stephen streets, striking the surrafic railway between Stephen and Bridport streets; thence an open cutting about 13 chains to Victoria parade. Model School to Victoria parade line commences at the Model School; thence east through the centre of Victoria-parade in a covered way, 14 chains long, passing over the tramway and open cutting about 13 chains; thence across the open cutting about 13 chains, passing over the south end of Brunswick-street; thence an open cutting 235 chains to, within a few chains from the east side of Smith-street; thence 26 chains of an embankment along the parade until Hoddle-street a nearly reached; thence curving north into Hoddle-street; thence along the street of the present Fitzroy station, 26 chains of length supported on steel columns passing over Elizabeth and Swanston streets, into the Collingwood station, thence for about 3 chains in length, and connecting with the existing lines in the yard. Curtais and Fitzroy line branches off from the main central line at the Model School station north along the east side of the gardens in an open cutting, taking only a narrow strip of land from the side of the gardens, thus doing no material injury to the gardens; from the north-east angle of the gardens the line curves into the centre of Nicholson-street on a viaduct; thence along Nicholson-street about 40 chains, passing over the trains for; thence continuing the viaduct, and curving easterly into Alexandra parade (5 chains wide); thence along Queen-square to the present North Fitzroy station. Total length of viaduct, about 74 chains.

On the Carlton and Fitzroy line there would be four stations, viz., one at the Model School, and next in the north-east corner of Carlton gardens, another at the intersection of Nicholson-street and Alexander-parade, and the present station at the end of the existing line at Queen's parade, North Fitzroy. The total length of lines is about 4 miles 23 chains 41 links, being about 4,221 chains longer than the scheme submitted by the Railway Department, or, in other words, it is only about the cost of one of their lines.

2890. By Mr. Trethewey.—Does that include the cost of the land?—It includes everything; we would only require to purchase land at the stations.

2891. By the Chairman.—You would have to pay for property at Rolly-street?—Yes.

2892. At the junction of Victoria-street and Hoddle-street?—Yes; but although we had said to buy it, I would bring it out so that the State would be money in pocket by it. I would buy the whole block at a fair value and build my station there, and what we do not want we would sell, and we would be money in pocket by it. When you buy land along the other routes you destroy it. Here I would take it at what it is worth, build my station, and sell the balance.

I have not allowed or charged anything for land in this estimate, as very little land would have to be purchased on these lines; therefore the money would not be swallowed up in purchasing private property, but nearly the whole of the money would be paid in wages, giving employment to all sorts of labourers, and the work at the same time.

From an inspection of the plans and localities, it will be at once seen that the routes proposed by me are the best for the accommodation of the public, and will be the most advantageous to the public at large, and will better accommodate the travelling public, and produce a large population, as the result of the careful examination of the proposed line, I have made to the best of my knowledge and belief, that this line will be the most economical and the best line, because the lines and stations will be better placed, and better situated for picking up and setting down passengers, most of whom will use the main line as the centre of Melbourne would be situated in the centre of the city, and be easily reached by the railways in the city, and be in a position to bring the workers into the centre of the city, and let them have a short distance to walk to and from their various occupations in the morning and afternoon. On account of these eastern and western railways will be brought round to the south-east side of the city into Flinders-street station; if you do this the country will have more business lines and the price of land will be more reasonable.

This station is on the south side of the city at the Yarra bank, bounded by the river on one side, and is surrounded with permanent reserves of hundreds of acres; these reserves will prevent the city from extending south and east, and the only way the city can extend is north and west; there is no doubt, in my mind, but the city will extend west and north. In and around Spencer-street station the Government has bought hundreds of acres of land yet to dispose of, and what is now known as the swamp will, in the future—so I hold—that will be a busy and populous place, and perhaps, in a few years to come, that swamp will be a great business and residential centre, and the warehouses, factories, &c., and we should look around and ahead of us when designing and laying out our railways, and lay them down so that they will be a national as well as local benefit. The development of the city, the population of Melbourne, will be either an economic or national calamity, and the view will come when we shall be said that to bring all the northern railway they shall both be given the same care and attention. The stations shall have been made to suit the residents of Melbourne and suburbs. Where you have a station near the city. Melbourne has plenty of room for all requirements, hundreds of acres in one solid block, while at Flinders-street there is only about 100 acres in the whole width of the street, and the grounds are larger than this. Melbourne has room to extend west towards the bay, and as this country develops into a great exporting country the new industries will be established as near as possible to the port of departure.

The lines that I have laid down can be extended eastwards and westwards as required.

Let me again request you to look at the plans. At Prince-bridge station you will observe that there is only a very small portion of Melbourne east of Prince-bridge that will be benefited by this concessional traffic. You cannot expect to draw any money from Yarm-Farm Park, the Domain, Fitzroy and Treasury Gardens.

Fitzroy-street station any morning, and you will see the crowds of people travelling west, north, and east, clearly proving that it would be better to have the stations further northward and in the centre of the city as proposed by me.

Flinders-street station will have quite enough to do to accommodate the southern suburbs in the future, without having all the passenger traffic of the city and suburbs of Melbourne forced into it. It will be a great mistake to lay out our railways so that we will have only one station for the city of Melbourne. I think if this point is thought over it will be admitted that it would be a terrible blunder to have only one or two stations for Melbourne. From an examination of the plans and localities here from three to six stations would be required, and many of them not more than a quarter of a mile apart. At the same time Melbourne has to only two stations, and these on the outer edge of the city. Flinders-street has 8 stations; South Melbourne, 4; Richmond, 3; Prahran, 4; Hawthorn, 4; Melbourne 6; and Flemington, 6. On the Preston line, within 4 miles, are 8 stations. On Coburg, 6 stations in the same length. If you want these lines to pay it is quite right to have these stations conveniently situated for picking up traffic; but, on the other hand, the stations should also be studied for the convenience of the people in the centre of Melbourne.

If the lines and stations as proposed by me are constructed, they will give life to the northern, western, and eastern portions of Melbourne, which have very much neglected, looking at it from a national and commercial standpoint, as if laid out by me should be carried out.

Elevated railways are the best means to secure rapid and safe breath through dense populations and cities. Our streets are as they are in New York, Paris, and London, the most beautiful city of the world; there are many people who believe that the railways are the best means to increase the population of the city, and there are others who believe that they are the best means to increase the population of the city by the greatest extent possible.

The present traffic to the public and the increase in the value of property more than balances the costs of the railway, while the increased business facilities will outweigh any remaining prejudices.
P. W. Milne.
13th November, 1864.

The streets I propose to use are very wide, long, and straight, and the natural formation such that there will not be a level crossing on the whole of the line. This is an immense advantage in favour of a railway passing through three cities, and cannot be done on any other route about Melbourne.

On each side of the viaduct the road left for ordinary traffic will be greater than the whole width of Little Flinders-street, and you all know how much traffic there is in that street.

The viaduct in Flinders-street does not prevent the traffic on the street; the roadway between the viaduct and the railway is only 15 or 16 feet at one place.

In order to obtain a correct estimate of the cost of the schemes, the permanent surveys should be made in each case, plans and specifications drawn up, the amount of compensation or purchase money for private property fixed between the Government and owners, and the owners should be legally bound to accept that price. Tenders should be then called for, before either of the schemes are adopted by Parliament, and that would enable the cost to be known before any liabilities are incurred.

This system ought to be carried out on all large public works.

When you once commence to buy property along a line, the prices go up. If the prices are fixed, and people are bound down to those prices, you will have an idea what you will have to give.

2383. In the event of a portion of your scheme being adopted, which of the two lines would you prefer for paying the least? I presume before you came here you made your mind as to the population on both these routes, what the footing ground would be—I did not touch that point, because you have had that over and over again from other gentlemen, but I will show how these lines will pay without bothering about the population on the lines at all.

2389. By Mr. Treasurer,—How can you tell how the lines will pay unless you have estimated how many will travel, and how can you estimate that unless you know how many people there are?—I wrote to the Railway Department for some returns that I considered would be very valuable to the Committee, but I did not get them. I asked for a return showing the number of tickets issued during the twelve months ending 31st August, 1863, going to North Fitzroy, Northcote, Middle Northcote, Crayton, Thornbury, Bell-street, Murray-road, Regent-street, and Preston, on the Preston line; also from Preston back to Melbourne, and the same stations on the return journey. On the Heidelberg line I asked for similar information; that is, the tickets issued to and from Melbourne and Collingwood, Hill, Collingwood, Greenwich, Southport, Huntingfield, Mount Alexander, and Heidelberg, coming back again from Heidelberg to Melbourne; and also from Collingwood to Heidelberg, and Heidelberg to Collingwood. I wanted these returns so that I would be able to show what we have lost by not having direct communication with the city, and I believe it would assist you.

2385. By the Chairman.—How can you tell as that unless you have the population?—I am taking the people that we have carried.

2386. By Mr. Treasurer.—How do you know how many of them would travel over your lines, having reached the stations you referred to?—I do not count past Collingwood; they come there to go to Smith-street, and even with a railway they would not go any further?—I have asked for a return. This return deals with people coming to Melbourne only—I leave out all the intermediate travel.

2387. You did not get those returns?—No. I have here a table which I can make calculations from to show what we have lost. This table shows the distances that the people would have to travel over my tracks, and by the present roundabout system from North Fitzroy. By my line it is 22 miles to the central station in Elizabeth-street, in the other case I take it to Flinders-street.

2388. You take the best for yourself and the worst for the other?—No; it is proposed to bring the lines to Flinders-street.

2389. They can get out at Spencer-street if they like?—Yes, but it is presumed that everybody wants to come to the bottom of Elizabeth-street, and I take it that North Fitzroy is 6 miles by that route as against 22 by mine. Northcote is 3-13 miles as against 63; Middle Northcote 7-5; and it is 3-72 miles.

2390. By the Hon. D. McNeil.—Why do you not compare yours with the proposed lines, not with the present ones?—I travel on the south suburban lines, and a number of gentlemen say to me—"Why do you bother your head about this? The northern people are well supplied with railway accommodation and there is no necessity for it." I can honestly say that every person I have explained the matter to says that the line should be made to the north.

2391. Your scheme is not in opposition to the scheme already in existence, but against the one proposed?—The public consider those lines to the northern suburbs should not be made.

2392. By Mr. Treasurer.—There is a route proposed along Heidelberg-street and through Richmond Park; why not make comparisons between your proposal and the other proposals to supply the northern suburbs of a similar nature to your own?—My object is to educate the public up to the necessity of those lines, because the public say it is only a waste of money. I want them to stop the leakage; they are calling out that the railways are not paying, and they will not stop the leak.

2393. By the Chairman.—Your contention is that if you cut off that roundabout route of 3 or 4 miles there would be a larger proportion coming by the direct route than you come round by Spencer-street?—That is what I am trying to show that I can carry out the whole of my scheme, and pay the whole interest on the capital, out of savings alone.

2394. By Mr. Treasurer.—Is that out of manageable expenses?—Out of the waste that is going on by those means of travelling expenses. The reason why Mr. Capp can bear the railways is that you bring the people to the skirts of the city and leave them there, and he takes them into it. I am going to take the people into the city and distribute them through it. That is where the trains have borne the railways in Melbourne. I have so interest in the matter personally.

2395. By the Chairman.—Many people agree that there should be a direct line, but the question is, which direct line should be made?—I think mine should be. The public say the lines should not be made at all?—I want to show that they should be made; people do not know the leakage that is going on. On the 13th October you had a large number of very poor train service—seven trains a day and eight on Sunday to Heidelberg, and seventeen to Preston; this will run in a year to 2,500 trains to Heidelberg. On that poor train service you travel 91 miles a day for nothing, equal to a trip from Melbourne to...
Bendigo; and in a year on that service you travel 29,515 miles for nothing. I will save that distance by my track. Each of those trips will cost 3s. 5s. 9d. per mile to run, according to the average given by the Railway Department in the last Report. I communicated with the Railway Department asking them to supply me with the train mileage on the Hadfield and Preston lines, in a way that I could make a more accurate calculation. I consider that the cost on the Preston and Hadfield line is on the higher side than the average, because you have a less number of trains; and the less number of trains you run the greater the average cost; therefore, I believe, the train mileage will cost more there than on the Brighton and Balnarring lines, where we run 80 trains a day.

1986. By Mr. Bussmacher.—How does running a larger number of trains reduce the average?—I run two trains a day, and you have the same staff, the average cost will be more than when you run twenty trains. On the Hadfield line alone I will save £3,443 in the year on train miles; and if you add to that the trains that stop at Collingwood, and feel the trains as present, and send them through to Spencer-street, I will have an increase. We have six trains running to Collingwood every day—all the Sunday trains run through. In a week that will amount to 54 trains, and in a year you will have 2,817 trains. On that there is a leakage of 101 miles a day, or 31,761 miles in a year; that is equal to running a train from Melbourne to Bendigo and back empty—that is a thing that you can stop.

1987. By Mr. J. S. White.—Have you calculated any revenue received from North Melbourne to Royal Park and North Fitzroy?—No.

1988. There is a revenue there!—The Brunswick line will come in there. There are only seven trains a day on this line.

1989. Is there no traffic from Royal Park and North Fitzroy?—I am not taking the traffic from North Fitzroy.

1990. Will the people at the top of Carlton who are now supplied come over to the railway?—The people in the red line on the map is my gathering ground.

1991. What would you do with the population that want to come in between the red line and the Royal Park?—There are let very few in there; they would be nearly half a mile from the Brunswick line.

1992. You say those 101 miles a day would be run for nothing—some of those people would make use of the trains!—Those people would walk to that station, no doubt; but the trains would be practically running for nothing—there would be very few people. If these trains ran through the leakage would be 31,761 miles in a year. On the Preston line we have got only seventeen trains a day, and seven on Sundays; that makes 103 trains in a week, or 5,698 in a year. On these we will save 129 miles in a day, which runs out to 6,608 miles in a year.

1993. By Mr. Curnow.—You reckon that saving from where the Preston line joins your line round to Spencer-street!—Yes.

1994. The difference is between coming your shorter route and the longer route!—Yes.

1995. Have you allowed for the fact that the train service that comes through helps to make up the service for the people along this other portion of the line?—There are only seven trains a day, and they pass through a place where there is practically no population. There is no gathering ground on the Preston line; the 6,008 miles saved is worth £6,998 a year. Then on those two lines I will save 224 miles a day, at 3s. 6d. a mile in a year I have a saving of 101,774 miles, that amounts to £17,099. If you capitalize that it will run out to over £300,000, so you can borrow the money to do the whole work and have £50,000 left.

1996. Against that, you will not have to put on some extra trains to give the people at Royal Park the service they now enjoy.—I do not think not; but if you want to put on an extra train or two you can do it.

1997. The poor service on the Brunswick line, the poor service on the Whitehorse line, and the poor service on the Collingwood line altogether, when they come to the common junction at the Royal Park, gives a very fair service from that point on to North Melbourne?—Yes, but when are you going to bring it? There is no one to accommodate.

1998. All the service the people at Macaulay-road, the Flemington-road, and up to the Royal Park would have would be the present Brunswick service!—Yes, but there is hardly any one there. If you increase the trains along there you also increase your leakage as your business develops under present conditions as do your losses. The leakage on the Hadfield line is £2,043, and the leakage on the Collingwood line at present would be £2,500, and on the Preston line leakage per annum is £6,000; that makes a total of £17,583, and that, if capitalized, would be more than £500,000. It was mentioned by the Engineer-in-Chief that you would have an increased train service to the northern suburbs. If you had a train service running to Preston and Hadfield equal to what is going to Collingwood at present, the leakage would be £52,912 a day, or in a year £14,500; and if you had a service equal to Sandringham the leakage would be £13,300 miles in a year—the value of that would be £27,304; there are 26 trains a day to Sandringham.

1999. By Mr. J. S. White.—Would you construct the line to Flinders-street?—Whether my line is constructed or the other lines, I say one of them should be constructed.

2000. Whatever it costs: yours is £24,000, as against half-a-million!—A line that can be made for half the money will pay when perhaps the other will not. I will pay the interest on the whole of the cost of my line from the start, out of the savings. As the business develops in the northern suburbs, so does the leakage now. If we take and compare the northern suburbs with the Castlemill district, if we ran as many trains to the northern suburbs as are going to Castlemill at the present time, the express train miles that we would run would be 231,567 in a year, or equal to 1,144 miles a day. That would be like going to Bendigo five times and back for nothing; that put into money would represent £62,192 in a year. I might mention that the time last by a person coming from South Norwood to to Melbourne in a day would amount to 391 days in a year, of eight hours a day, and he would travel a year 1,145 miles more than was necessary: that would be 11 miles 22 chases each day more than was required. Comparing the train and tram fares from Clifton Hill, a man coming in second class would save £1.7s. 6d. a year by coming by train instead of by tram, and about 24 days in a year. From Collingwood station by my track it would be 2 miles 29 chases—by the present route it is about 8 miles.
3011. By the Hon. D. Melville.—You have not yet shown us why we should prefer your line to the other proposals?—I take my line through the centre of Melbourne, and I give the citizens and people doing business with them an opportunity of selecting stations in the heart of the city on my lines. I take in a larger gathering area than the ones proposed by the Department, and the stations are also in a better paying position. I do not interfere with private property. I can construct lines for about half the cost of the other lines. I lay the foundations for future extension, and I turn the Brunswick line into a paying one. If you take the people to the central station at St. Francis's Church in Elizabeth-street, you are in the centre of the city.

3012. By Mr. Craven.—Would you bring the Brunswick and Coburg traffic into Spencer-street?—Yes.

3013. Your main central station is Spencer-street; the traffic from the northern suburbs would come into Spencer-street, and your round into Lonsdale-street—you would make Flinders-street a roadster station?—Yes, as it should be.

The witness withdrew.

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

——————

TUESDAY, 24TH NOVEMBER, 1896.

Members present:

Mr. Cameron, in the Chair;

The Hon. J. Buchanan, M.L.C., Mr. Burton,
The Hon. D. Molville, M.L.C., Mr. Craven,
The Hon. E. Morey, M.L.C., Mr. Harris,
Robert Barr, sworn and examined.

3014. By the Chairman.—What are you?—A journalist, auditor, and accountant.

3015. Did you audit the accounts of the city of Fitzroy?—I have for several years. This is a statement in connection with the Tramways Company's operations which I desire to hand in. I have abstracted this from the published statements of the tramways returns for the past ten years.

3016. By Mr. Burton.—Where did you get the returns?—In the Tram Company's Balance-sheets and in the chairman's annual statements in the Argus and Age. In some instances I have the original documents. I have sent a copy of this to the chairman of the Tramways Company informing him that I intended to publish it, and I asked him if there was anything he desired to comment on; I have not yet had a reply.—[The witness handed in the following statement:—]

MELBOURNE TRAMWAY AND OMNIBUS COY. LTD.

ABSTRACT OF RESULTS FROM 1887 TO 1896.—REPRODUCED FROM ANNUAL STATEMENTS OF DIRECTORS.

In 1887 the following tram lines were in operation:—

Bridge-road, Richmond
Victoria-parade, Richmond and Collingwood.
Brunswick-street, Fitzroy.
Smith-street, Fitzroy and Collingwood.

Other lines were opened as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Cable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1st August</td>
<td>Nicholson-street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1st October</td>
<td>Sydney-road, Brunswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>15th October</td>
<td>Carlton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Portsea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>St. Kilda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Toorak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>24th Street, North Carlton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>North Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>West Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>South Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Port Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>27th October</td>
<td>St. Kilda Esplanade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>How Trans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Hawthorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Zooological Gardens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Length of Track.

Cable, 411; horse, 43 miles. Total, 454 miles. Cost, with engines, &c., £1,640,000.

The lines and engines-houses are the property of the Tramway Trust, but the cars, grip, car-houses, head offices, car works, &c., are the property of the company, and figure in the balance-sheet at £206,247.
## PASSENGER TRAFFIC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
<th>Pence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Results

In 1887 the company had a capital of £250,000. In 1889 they increased this out of profits by declaring a bonus of £150,000, and capitalising the amounts in shares paid up to 1½, bringing the total capital to £300,000.

In 1890 they repeated the operation by giving a bonus of £125,000 to shareholders, after shares paid up to 1½, each The market price of shares as quoted in the Argus when these were issued to shareholders was, in 1890, £1 4s. per share, and in 1891, £1 6s. 8d.

By giving the shareholders the shares instead of telling them to the public the company practically raised (as divided to £1 2½ per £25,000 in 1886 and to £760,000 in 1890, in addition to the dividend paid in the ordinary way in each of three years) (see dividend list).

### Dividends Paid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dividends Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>£25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Profits from Sale of Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Profits from Sale of Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>£35,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>£35,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All dividends were paid in a reserve fund and then used to wipe out the goodwill which appeared in the balance-sheet of 1887 at £3,000. The whole amount was capitalised out of profits in 1888 and 1889.

The profits, in addition to the amounts divided amongst shareholders as bonuses and dividends, the company set aside the following sums as Reconstruction and General Reserve:

### Notes

- The company has thereupon been sold to the Railway Trust before the individual lines became productive, a suspense account was opened, and these items entered carried to it. The company then adopted the plan of reducing the amount at the rate of about £10,000 per year, and since 1887 the total has been reduced from £200,000 to £50,000.

- The company has also largely increased its assets since 1887, notwithstanding the sale of a number of valuable properties.

In 1887 the balance-sheet showed—Assets, £62,714. In 1890 the total stood at—Property and Plant, £56,714, at an interest of £234,003. If the whole of the new capital, £200,000, is set off against this income, there is still a sum of £50,000, which has been obtained out of the profits.

Besides these direct profits to the shareholders, the company has paid off the interest on the Railway Trust bonds, and the Sale Fund to the Railway Trust, the following amounts (less the £12,000 per year before referred to):

### Interest on Loans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Interest on Loans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>£13,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>£13,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>£13,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>£13,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>£13,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>£13,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>£13,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sale Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sale Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>£16,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>£16,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>£16,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>£16,256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In 1889 the passenger traffic was influenced by the Melbourne Exhibitions, the number carried being equal to 144 days for every man, woman, and child in the metropolitan population £45,000. In 1890 the Exhibitions had closed, still the traffic increased, the trip owing list for every hand of the population.*
Briefly summarized, the result of ten years' operations on an initial capital of £250,000 provided by the company is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic receipts</th>
<th>£16,000</th>
<th>Profit.</th>
<th>£250,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dividends paid</td>
<td>436,385</td>
<td>Monopoly</td>
<td>96,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets increased-</td>
<td>44,636</td>
<td></td>
<td>69,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwill written off</td>
<td>197,617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary expenses paid</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenses</td>
<td>567,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest paid</td>
<td>1,501,805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Trust</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Fund, Tramways Trust</td>
<td>224,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result in ten years after paying working expenses: £1,900,883

### Summary of Principal Working Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wages</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>38,455</td>
<td>36,375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>103,743</td>
<td>104,015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>133,476</td>
<td>111,762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>133,476</td>
<td>95,574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>119,940</td>
<td>17,091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>171,965</td>
<td>35,349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>179,621</td>
<td>52,181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>150,721</td>
<td>31,657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>199,53</td>
<td>32,361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>199,53</td>
<td>47,039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Prior to 1901 the cost of repair and fuel was not given separately.

Point was given to the fact that the company owns the car-houses, cars, grips, &c., by the evidence of the Managing Director, Mr. R. B. Clark, before the Railways Standing Committee. He said that the Committee that the company would mortgage its properties and rolling-stock, expend its reserves, and call up the balance of its capital to fight railway competition, so that the municipalities would be left with a crippled concern or if the lines fell into their hands. There was not the slightest necessity for such a position. It was originally intended that the Tramway Trust should be protected against such a proceeding, and steps should be taken when the company's Act came before the Parliament next year to see that the municipalities are properly safeguarded in this direction. The elasticity of the train traffic, and the enormous profits already made together with the handsome surplus over working expenses, obtained even when the depression was at its worst, is evidence that the municipalities have a splendid property in the trains under any circumstances, and any attempt to play on their fears is not warranted by the circumstances or conditions, either of the traffic or of the company, except with regard to its present power to mortgage or dissipate its assets.

The witness withdrew.

### John Mathieson, sworn and examined.

#### 1891. By the Chairman.—You are the Commissioner of the Victorian Railways?—Yes, since the 1st of July last.

#### 1891. Do you know what are called the northern suburbs, with all the outlets and inlets?—In a general way, I have endeavoured to make myself acquainted with them—the cities of Collingwood and Fitzroy, also the lines leading therefrom.

#### 1891. What is the capital cost of those lines, say, the Heidelberg and Whittlesea, and that portion of the Outer Circle?—From Fitzroy to Whittlesea, a distance of 22 miles, the capital cost was £2,18,208; Collingwood to Heidelberg, a distance of 51 miles, the capital cost was £189,654. Fairfield Park to Riverside, 51 miles, the capital cost was £178,000. Royal Park to Clifton Hill, including the Fitzroy branch, 39 miles, the capital cost was £231,175.

#### 1891. To those lines pay now?—They do not pay working expenses.

#### 1891. What is the amount of annual loss?—On the North Fitzroy to Whittlesea line the annual loss in working for last year was £7,854; on the Collingwood to Heidelberg, £2,182. The Fairfield Park to Riverside line is closed, so the interest is the only loss there. From Royal Park to Clifton Hill, including the Fitzroy branch, the loss was £2,907. These are the amounts that those lines were short of paying working expenses without the interest.

#### 1891. What is the total loss?—The annual interest on the capital expended on the Fitzroy to Whittlesea line is £3,573; on the Collingwood to Heidelberg, £7,928; on the Fairfield Park to Riverside, £7,144; and on the Royal Park to Clifton Hill, including the Fitzroy branch, £9,247. The total annual loss for interest and working expenses on the North Fitzroy to Whittlesea line is £17,728; Collingwood to Heidelberg, £9,744; Fairfield Park to Riverside, £7,144; and Royal Park to Clifton Hill, including Fitzroy branch, £12,954, making a total of £65,070.

#### 1891. Do you think you will be able to reduce those losses if you have your own way of connecting the lines with the city?—I see no prospect of reducing the losses on those lines except by direct connexion through the city as shown on this Committee. I have not been able to look at these lines during the last five months that you would be able to reduce the loss materially?—The loss is so great that we could not wipe it out altogether, but we would go on a long way towards wiping out the deficit in the working expenses within a reasonable time. By giving us this direct connexion there is an immediate prospect of being able to reduce the loss very materially on these lines, but without that direct connexion I do not see any immediate prospect of improving matters whatever.

#### 1891. Do you think it is necessary to make both the Collingwood and Fitzroy connexions?—I do.

#### 1891. If there were only one of those lines constructed, would it take the feeding ground of the other line, or would that be lost?—It would take it, but only to a very small extent, and from a
3027. Do you think you could work the whole of that traffic in Flinders-street?—I do.

3028. Would it reduce the present cost of these two stations?—Yes; by dispensing with Prince's-bridge station we believe we could save £27,000 a year. By putting the additional service through Flinders-street it might reduce the £27,000 to about £25,000; but that, as far as we can see, is the outside of our extra expenditure for staff.

3029. Would it assist the lines to pay to have access backwards and forwards from the northern suburbs to the southern?—Most materially. Look at the Tramway Company; they run from Stony Park to St. Elmo's, and from Stony Park to Bulleen; and, as far as they can, they endeavour to make it a continuous service. In the same way our traffic is practically blocked now at Collingwood; we cannot carry it to its destination at all, because it is handered over there to the Tram Company. Those lines would enable us to complete the circle, and to carry our passengers to the end of their journey, instead of putting them to the expense of taking a tram or car to join the train service on the south side in Flinders-street, or to get to their destination as best they can. By this means we would enable them to get there without all this inconvenience of changing, and that is still more difficult in dealing with country lines. Country people have some luggage to carry, and those through lines would be of immense assistance to the people living outside of Melbourne now who are served by these lines, and also of assistance to the people on the southern side to get to their destination without change of train or having to take a car to carry their luggage from one train to another. Those trains would be continuous, or would merely transfer from one platform to another at Flinders-street.

3030. Do you think these lines are located in the best position to do what you say, to enable people to get to the northern suburban stations?—By far. I can judge they are. That line from Fitzroy would be a continuation of the present spur from the Royal Park and Collingwood line.

3031. Would these tunnels be any detriment to people travelling?—Not in the slightest. I should explain to the Committee that I hope to adopt what they call Pintsch's compressed gas. Each car carries its own quantity of gas. It is superior to any light we have had in this colony before the officers of the Department state that. There is no arrangement at the end of each car whereby a cock is turned on when we start from a station when we have to go through a tunnel, and having gone through, it is then turned off. It is to use on the underground lines in London, and they have this gas also in use on every important line out of London. Any one can read as well from that gas as from the ordinary daylight. The Fitzroy line tunnel is about one-third of a mile long.

3032. By Mr. Burton.—Would that gas reduce the temperature in hot weather?—I do not think the heat from the gas would be felt during the short time during the day, but at night it will slightly warm the atmosphere but not more than the present oil lamp. I am assured it is a very satisfactory light from every point of view.

3033. By the Chairman.—As to the Collingwood line, there are three routes mentioned, as you are aware—the Wellington-parade route, the one north of the Melbourne Cricket Ground, and the one south of the Melbourne Cricket Ground—which of these three do you favour?—I prefer the Wellington-parade route. The only alteration I would suggest would be that in place of running it along the front of Wellington-parade I would run it closer to the street at the back of that. It is a street not of much use, and the line would be no great detriment to it because the traffic on it is light.

3034. Why do you prefer that, because it occurs to some of the Committee that a number of people going to the cricket and football matches would make a great deal of traffic?—I have resided in Jolimont-terrace for three months since my arrival here, and I know there are very large masses held on the cricket ground, but on the whole there are not more than from twelve to twenty of these large masses per annum. It would not be worth while to retain carriages for that traffic from your end to your end's, and the residential traffic would be streamed aside by that proposal. Therefore we say the line should not be run for the residential traffic, but as close to the residential population as can be, and the station that is fixed at the end there, in the open space opposite Sir William Clarke's house, is the proper place for the station, because if you put the line closer to the cricket ground you will make the whole of the residential people walk all that distance, and the additional traffic there would be infinitesimal as there would be infinitesimal in the new residential population. The traffic from Collingwood we would always get coming to the cricket ground.

3035. Even if the line came along Wellington-parade there would be no feeding ground south of that?—No, except Jolimont-terrace. The amount of traffic there is small, but it is on the left-hand side of the line going to Collingwood that the residential population is, and it is for that district alone that the line was proposed to be built that way.

3036. You do not value the number you would get for twenty matches in a year?—I think the number we are likely to get at the matches we would get under any circumstances, but if you are going to put the station about 350 yards away from Wellington-parade you would probably lose the residential population and leave it to the trains, because I do not think people would walk that distance unless they were going to a position that could be served by that railway line alone.

3037. By Mr. Darley.—Would it not be better to provide for the cricket ground with an extra track from Heidelberg?—That would serve the cricket people just as well; there would have to be the access off the line of the, but I understand that the Department have interfered rather objected to the necessity for an additional suburban line there. They simply want a very good expenditure to fix it in rotation for the sake of the traffic which was only twenty times a year, and at such a rate of fare that it would be practically valueless for the Department. The distance is so short that few people would go to the station—the great bulk of them walk there.

3038. By the Chairman.—Do you look on these northern suburban lines as being wholly for the suburban traffic, or do you expect anything from the back country?—I look on them as the completion of the country lines and the joining up of the suburban lines. The people from the Heidelberg districts are now served. There is a passenger service from the Fitzroy express service and we have a passenger service from the north and the southern lines would materially improve the earning capacity of the country lines, and at the same time complete our suburban circle round the city of Melbourne.
3039. You do not agree with those who contend that they are well supplied already by going round to Spencer-street through Brunswick and Royal Park?—I think the only people who have that idea are the tramway Company, because no doubt they would lose possibly on a million passengers per annum if we proposed to carry the people directly through.

3040. You have no desire to snuff out the Tramway Company?—I think the tramways are a credit to the city of Melbourne, and we have no desire in any shape or form to detract from their merits. I think there is no reason why we should want to term avarice one with the other, because there is ample room for us both in a great city like Melbourne to do the best we can for our respective interests.

3041. You have no intention of reducing the fares on the railways, if constructed, to cause a similar reduction on the trams?—Most certainly not. I think it would be very bad policy if that were the only reason we could adduce to your Committee, that we could, by opposing the trains, force the traffic on to those lines. We have no such intention, so far as I am personally concerned, and I think that the terms of unity on which we are working with the trains are not likely to be at all disturbed by the construction of those lines; at least, they will not be on the part of the Railway Department.

3042. At present you know the quantity of goods delivered at North Fitzroy, Clifton Hill, and Collingwood, which are the main stations beyond the northern suburbs?—Yes.

3043. I think the Traffic Manager when before us said he did not calculate on anything being got from goods coming in to Melbourne—that would infer that the goods would still have to be got round by Royal Park and Spencer-street—do you think that would be a fair way of dealing with the goods that come now out at North Fitzroy, Clifton Hill, and Collingwood?—I think the Traffic Manager is making up the statement for the line did not think it was fair to take any of the present traffic that we have arising at Collingwood or Fitzroy. Those figures were given to me and were forwarded to you in that way. There is no doubt that at one time it was the intention of the Department, in building those Outer Circle lines, to run the goods service round the Outer Circle instead of going through Flinders-street; but the number of trains to be dealt with there is so small at the present time that we could run them all by those suburban lines without any difficulty whatever. Clifton Hill, Collingwood, and Fitzroy are the only depots for dealing with goods traffic on those lines. The other stations on the continuation of both services are built purely as passenger stations; but there is no difficulty in dealing with fruit and vegetables or traffic sent by a mixed train from the country districts lying beyond. Take a case in point. We are endeavouring to make a speciality of fruit and colonial wine at special rates. At any of those stations we could deal with that traffic without any difficulty for instance, if we choose like Fox and Gibson's offer us parcels traffic we would be delighted to have it. The idea the Traffic Manager had in his head was more particularly as to regret traffic going through to the Melbourne terminus, and we did not think it was desirable to credit any portion of the receipts to those lines, because we have already a route that can serve that purpose.

3044. You do not see any difficulty in delivering parcels at all the stations between those three stations now and Flinders-street?—No difficulty whatever.

3045. By Mr. Burton.—The only difficulty is they will not give the traffic to you—Fox and Gibson and they would not give it because they deliver the goods at people's doors?—That is only for suburban goods, and it is possible that firms might change their mind. Outside the suburban area people would be inclined to take the nearest point—it would not be reasonable to expect a large warehouse like Fox and Gibson's to hand us their suburban traffic—it is the outside traffic we speak of.

3046. By the Chairman.—The hundreds and thousands of tons that have to come in from those districts?—Yes. Assume for a moment that there is fruit coming by the morning trains—just as we have fish from another part; we never hesitate to put out fish or milk or any perishable produce at any station, though not a goods station. We do that all over the country. We had a complaint a month or two ago that at certain stations where women were in charge they could not get perishables landed—we rectified the matter, and now accept them at all stations. Arrangements may have to be made to have the freight prepaid, but that can easily be done. At each of those stations there will be a staff that can deal with that traffic; handy packages, such as galleons packages of fruit, or up to a cwt, and, as a rule, raspberries and other fruit are sent in small packages, so there would be no difficulty in dealing with them at any of those stations.

3047. Any quantity of strawberries and raspberries are coming by the passenger train from Lilydale now?—Yes, I believe this is the season.

3048. There wouldn't be more difficulty in dealing with them on those lines than there is on the Lilydale?—No.

3049. By Mr. Burton.—Have those delivery packages anything to do with making the trains late?—No doubt they have. There is a great many mixed trains run in the country, and of course those cannot be run with the same degree of accuracy as to time as a passenger train. They are liable to more or less detention in the work to be done at each station. One day they may have only one shunt to make, and another they may have six, and that is the reason the mixed trains do not keep to time so well as the other trains do. These things are all being very carefully looked into by the Traffic Manager with the view of, as far as possible, dealing with every case as it arises so as to obtinate this undue delay to the mixed trains. As times improve fewer of those mixed trains will run and more goods trains will be put on, so the same remarks will not be applicable to the changed circumstances, but at present we doubt very often subjected to these delays in consequence of the amount of work they have to perform on the way to town.

3050. Would you carry small parcels of perishable goods on those trains?—Yes, anything in the shape of parcels traffic?

3051. By Mr. Cranen.—On the Eessendon line they carry milk with the passenger trains in the morning?—Yes.

3052. By Mr. Trevenith.—You said there is practically no traffic now at the Fitzroy station?—No passenger traffic.

3053. Where does the Whitlease train go?—It is carried round to Spencer-street.

3054. By the Chairman.—It comes out at North Fitzroy?—That is so; the trains now run round, but the passenger themselves leave the train at North Fitzroy to go to the tram station at Fitzroy.

3055. By Mr. Trevenith.—As to the proposed tunnel, you think it would not be inconvenient because you would have a special kind of light, but is that the only inconvenience from a tunnel?—There
is no inconvenience in a tunnel of this length, because the ventilation will be first-rate. The only inconvenience would be that for the third of a minute they might be under the earth.

3055. The difficulty that stands in travelling in Europe is that the carriages are wonderfully dirty from the smoke and dust in rushing through it, but difficult to keep the carriages clean under these circumstances. All trains going into tunnels are more or less subjected to that more than in the open; but in the open on a stormy day the steam and dust and ashes are blown into the carriages. In a tunnel they have not the same strong wind blowing, but naturally too smoke and ashes from the engines are always liable to come into the carriage, but I do not think for a short tunnel it would be at all noticeable in a suburban service such as this.

3057. The trains will necessarily be travelling frequently through this tunnel; there would be a large number of trains in a day through the tunnel is short. Yet, perhaps about six an hour.

3058. That would make it like a continuous tunnel? Yes, but that amount of smoke would be got rid of very easily.

3059. As to the two lines, we are to understand that it is necessary that anything less than a double service for the northern suburbs service would be altogether insufficient. As or as the amount of money to be saved by building only one line and the probability that in a year or two you would be asked to duplicate the line, I think it would be far more economical to build the two lines now—give the lines to the district without spending the money that would be necessary to make the temporary connections. The expense of working the loop lines would be very considerable. You would have to double shift the cabins at each end. The cabins would cost £400 a year for wages alone, so from an economical view it is much better to give us the two lines now than to put off and build the one line only leaving what would be ultimately necessary—the duplication of the lines—instead of giving a proper connection to the district we wish to serve by building the two lines now.

3060. Having in view the traffic to be obtained from the two lines and the practical economy in the working, and to save money by building the two lines at once?

3061. By the Hon. D. M'Leod—The Committee are deeply interested in this—we are to make a new cost of perhaps £400,000; standing alone, will that expenditure pay interest and working expenses?—I believe it will, and I would like to just say—of course I am not professing with my knowledge to say that I know the localities as thoroughly well as I would like to, because I have not been able to devote all my time to this matter since I came here—looking at the figures that have been given by the officers of the Department, I think that their estimate is, to say the least of it, a most reasonable one. There has been no desire at inflation in any shape or form; I think that because they show they are within £4,000 of paying working expenses and interest. There is one very important asset that has been left out of consideration altogether in this matter—that in building these lines mutually the Department will take over a lot of property which will have to be acquired whether the railway requires it or not, that is to say, in taking the part of an allotment or the part of a building we will have to take the whole building or allotment. There is no doubt that those properties will become valuable to the Department, and I think it is only reasonable to assume that the revenue to be derived from those properties will in a short time be equal to the amount of loss of interest in the cost of construction of those lines.

3062. Then I understand you briefly to say that we run no risk of increasing the annual deficit on the railways if we take these two lines?—I quite appreciate the question; and, of course, coming as I do into a concern that has a deficit, naturally I do not wish to add to the liabilities of the Department in any shape or form; and, therefore, I say advisedly, that I believe that the construction of these two lines, in place of adding a loss to the Department, will enable us, most assuredly, to reduce our present liabilities to a very considerable extent over and above providing ample revenue to pay working expenses and interest.

3063. By Mr. Tennent.—You gave the present loss on four lines; you think that loss will be reduced in some measure by the construction of these lines?—I do. I said I hoped that in a few years' time, even if I could not look forward to the wiping out of the interest, I could to the wiping out of a large proportion of the loss on the working expenses on the various lines.

3064. By the Hon. D. M'Leod.—Then I am right that you contemplate a reduction of the present loss, hoping that within a year or two this new railway will be a paying concern?—I say I believe the construction of these lines will be a paying concern, per se, independently of the great convenience to the people in the country, forming a connecting link between those places and the city—and, as far as I can judge, the only way of reducing our present loss on the lines that have been constructed in the vicinity.

3065. Mr. Clapp asserts this railway will interfere with the tram lines. This is from his evidence:—

If it is affected (the railways must set the tone?—Not necessarily, because the fares on the trams will be reduced to compete with the railway.

Do you not think that there is room for both?—No, I do not; I think the districts of Collingwood and Fitzroy are well served.

You would put a bar over against any railways being constructed in that direction?—I cannot bar these, I simply give my opinion, which is only one man’s opinion.

I understand that you wish to lay these railways—the there is no time when you would ever think it proper for the State to build either of them?—I certainly think the present is a most propitious time to talk of it, if the deficit last year was £200,000 or £200,000, and is likely to be as much this year.

Do you think this 4 miles old of railway will cross the tramway to the extent of diminishing their fares?—Of course, I have no idea what the tramway people might do to meet the fact that we intend to carry these people through the city ourselves; but, I think, it is hardly at all reasonable to expect that they would quote a fare; for instance, take a man from Whitley, to make him leave the train at North Fitzroy and join the tram, seeing we could run him through; or a passenger from Heidelberg would leave the train (Collingwood) to join the tram, seeing we could run him through the city ourselves. It would be, to say the least of it, a very strange action on the part of the Tramway Company, if they put themselves in such a position that they would endeavour to cut the fare so low as to actually take the passengers from our train.

3066. The question put to Mr. Clapp was this:—The railways, 16½ miles, earn £330,000 per annum; and 4½ miles of tramway only bring somewhat about the same amount of money, therefore, you do not show by this reasoning that there is a much greater preference for the railways over the trams. Have
you had the figure placed before you of the entire suburban system, that is, taking the whole of the lines in the circle known as the suburban railways, and do you know the results financially, not of 15½ miles, but of the entire system of suburban railways?—do you know the income from that?—No, I have not that. I have not an assurance that, as a whole, the suburban lines are in the black, the suburban lines show a profit.

3065. You admit that the whole system, bad and good, taken as a circle, pays you?—Yes.

3066. Taking out the political prejudices as to certain lines, your answer is, that the suburban lines as a whole pay?—That is what I am informed.

3067. The table put into Mr. Clapp's hands before the Railway Inquiry Board indicated that the suburban railway passengers left a net of only £25,000—that is, the whole of those good and bad railways put together leave the State from passenger fares a loss of only £25,000. I have seen that in Mr. Clapp's evidence.

3067. If the freight and parcels are added to that, what aspect does it show then?—It shows a balance on the other side.

3067. Is it fair to take the passenger list only?—It is not fair.

3067. What is now desired to be brought out is, the proposition to construct a single-completion of less than 5 miles of new railway, is it likely to interfere with your average return from the suburban system?—We hope it will improve, not only our country service, but our suburban service by enabling us to join up the lines together.

3067. Thus, if you put £20,000 a mile for only 15½ miles, what would be a fair estimate in such populous districts as Fitzroy and Collingwood per mile?—It is rather a difficult question to answer. I could not venture, with my limited knowledge of the suburbs, to answer that.

3067. The departmental evidence is that on the 15½ miles you take £20,000 a mile. Do you think it would be seriously under this average of £20,000, if we attach such important places as Fitzroy and Collingwood—would we get £15,000 a mile?—The estimate that we have given is under that. For Fitzroy, for 2 miles is £20,000, but it is perfectly natural to assume that these lines running through a densely populated district should give you as good a revenue as the suburban lines, and yield £20,000 a mile.

3067. You wish to dispel the illusion that the suburban railways are a non-paying concern, though there are exceptions?—As a whole, I am assured, and my experience so far justifies it, that the suburban service is a very satisfactory service as far as the Department is concerned. It is a very good paying business, and we improve it;—it is the easiest kind of traffic to handle.

3067. You have very little fear that if we authorize this additional distance we shall be acting rightly?—I do so say. I think the Committee will be acting properly; but if we go further, I think it is very far from just treatment that the Department, having been put to the large expenditure of building all these lines round the city, should be blocked from giving the public the convenience that they demand, at the instance of a private corporation.

3067. If they admit that it will affect the traffic of five lines of trunk, is not it a bad one for the railway?—It is a proof to me that we will able to compete on favorable terms with the tram.

3067. Have you studied the time-table that the Department gives—Gray-street, three minutes from Flinders-street, and so on?—Yes.

3067. Do you think that such a time-table as that can be efficiently carried out?—

3069. By Mr. Burton.—And drop the permissive goods at the same time?—These would not be on the suburban trains at all; those are from the outer country lines.

3081. By the Hon. D. Malville.—My question has nothing to do with permissive goods at all. The very essence of the affair is your time. If you connect with Flinders-street those immense populations in the brief periods given on the time-table, do you say that you can efficiently and safely carry that out?—I propose that the trains shall run from Flinders-street, and I would propose to add to the Fitzroy time of eight minutes an additional minute—make it nine. I am adding no half-a-mile at the end of the line, and I would add another minute to the time given for the through trains.

3082. If you establish that through traffic how will you settle as to months?—Take Coburg. I will give the figures for the Coburg line. For 1894, the passengers that were carried were 946,625; in 1895, the passengers were 1,305,712. The money received in 1894 was £7,566, in 1895 it was £9,686 showing an increase in 1895 over 1894 of nearly 40 per cent. in passengers and 20 per cent. in revenue. This may be said to have been brought about to a certain extent, possibly, by the reduction in fares, but more particularly by the admission of the Coburg lines into Flinders-street. There was an increase in that line of 25 per cent. over last year, and its revenue last year was about £40,000 a mile, or £140,000 was spent in building the line through that swamp; and with a train service of only 21 trains a day we have made an increase of 40 per cent. of passengers and 20 per cent. of revenue. I think from that fact we may infer, when we run a through service to and from Collingwood and Fitzroy we may look for a corresponding increase of revenue.

3083. By Mr. J. S. White.—Does not that £100,000 include the North Melbourne sidings?—The information I have is this, that the cost of the line from North Melbourne up to the first station, Brunswick, was £200,000. From the junction of the Coburg line with the lines at North Melbourne it cost £40,000 a mile.

3084. By the Hon. D. Malville.—The line had to be constructed twice in the Royal Park?—I have a map showing that the line was authorized and all arrangements made, and then it was cancelled and the line sent through the swamp, and now the Department has to bear the burden of that.

3085. It has a considerable goods traffic. I have applied for information as to the February goods at Melbourne, in the month of February, 1894, they took 31,198; in 1895, 25,906; and in 1896, 2606. That is through the failure of the wheat crop?—There is this explanation to be made, that the traffic might be from Swan Hill or Sea Lake, and it is set a revenue that applies to the Coburg line of itself.

3086. By Mr. Craven.—It might come on the Somerton Junction?—It might; but that shows the amount of business that is done on that description on the Coburg line.
3087. By the Hon. D. McErlre.—A man has hardly a right to shut the traffic out on the Fitzroy line and take only passengers. Have you fairly accounted for this traffic—those parcels of goods and milk and meal? It is a very large growing traffic, and we hope to largely augment it by every facility we can give the public to deal with the producers. A man can get his milk delivered at any station in the metropolis.

3088. Then if we could get all the figures in as to the suburban railways we would find that they are not losing revenue, but really profitable?—I think they are a very profitable asset—the suburban lines as a whole.

3089. By Mr. Cowen.—How do you account for the trainway people on the suburban line carrying three passengers to one of yours? The service is from there now is only about 24 trains in the eighteen hours—from six in the morning to twelve at night. That is about one and a half trains per hour. I leave it to any one to draw his own inference as to whether it would be possible to expect that we could get a suburban traffic with a train service every hour and a half, as against a train service running every ten minutes or quarter of an hour and picking up and setting down people at their own doors.

3090. If you get an increased train service, would that alter the result?—To a certain extent it would, but it is a question to consider; we have no desire to do ourselves an injury, or do the trains an injury, without benefiting ourselves. At the same time, to put it forcibly, the Department has not thought it desirable to run more trains than those at the present time; but no doubt, if the train service on this line were increased, we could compete a great deal more effectively with the train service, if the suburban trains are made one of the services, that is, to make a terminus at Northcote or Clifton Hill.

3091. Why has the better system existed there for some time?—I fancy, in the great depression, they endeavoured to reduce the expenditure, and they have not run more trains than they could possibly afford. They have given a certain service, and there has been no serious complaint about it, and it has been left to run; but there has been a grateful improvement since the trains went into Flinders-street.

3092. What about the loop from Brunswick?—The distance was the same, practically bringing the traffic from the Colburn line and the Fitzroy line, so what is it now the North Melbourne Swamp, 5 chains in favour of the present line, taking it to the middle of Flinders-street station. But there is no doubt a point might be raised there; the north suburban and all the traffic there might be worked in this way, in place of being left to find its way by tram and train service; in place of all the trains terminating at Northcote, some of them might terminate at North Carlton.

3093. If the Heidelberg line were linked up at Northcote station, or near there to fit in, come directly through North Fitzroy and joined the existing line, would make a great alteration in being able to add to the Heidelberg traffic, to bring it into Spencer-street instead of running it into Collingwood and to a dead end, to construct that loop and connect with the main line at North Fitzroy?—It would please the Department at all, because the people would have a line to North Fitzroy.

3094. What do you think of such a proposal?—It would suit the trains, but it would not suit the Department.

3095. Do you propose to bring the goods in to Flinders-street station by these routes, or would you take them on to Spencer-street? Suppose we had a through line to Collingwood or Fitzroy, would you bring all the goods traffic from the Whittlesea and Heidelberg line and deposit at the Flinders-street station or take them on the Spencer-street?—I would run on to Spencer-street. The terminus of those trains would be at Spencer-street.

3096. Would there be much saving in distance then?—That would be goods trains alone, and there is very little difference whether they are sent a mile round or not.

3097. What do you think of Mr. Fitzpatrick’s evidence on this? He was asked—"As the line from Preston to Whittlesea through agricultural and horticultural country, do you imagine that if this direct line were constructed it would encourage people to go for more horticulture?"—He replied—"We would not bring the traffic that way. Then it would not have an influence on the goods."—Not in the least. As to purely goods traffic, if it is going to Spencer-street, it would not matter materially for half-an-hour more or less, but any purely goods lines on those lines would be of no service whatever; there is not such a thing now, and of course they could be run the straightest route in.

3098. By Mr. J. S. White.—What about the mixed trains? They would come straight in, and those trains would run through Flinders-street up to Spencer-street, and leave their goods waggon there. I wish to impress on the Committee that for those country trains coming over these lines, in place of making Flinders-street their depot, they would run through to Spencer-street, and throw off the traffic; the mixed train would be re-combined there, and the trains from Spencer-street would be attached to, and the train would start from Spencer-street and run through Flinders-street as an ordinary suburban train, and pick up anything on those lines.

3099. By Mr. Cowen.—Mr. Fitzpatrick was further asked—"You would ask the Committee to discard any calculations or any influences as to goods?" He replied—"As traffic manager I have not made any allowance for goods, and I do not think any allowance should be made." Then—"Does the line now going round by Royal Park and Spencer-street, connecting with Preston and Whittlesea, give these people all the facilities they need for the transit of their fruit and goods?"—He replied—"Yes. They are charged the actual distance. Of course the difficulty is that any places within, say, 20 miles of Melbourne do not send in their staff by rail as a rule—their vegetables and fruit. Say you are an orchardist or a vegetable grower; you load up your vehicles, and you might just as well take it into market, as take it to the nearest station and unload, and load. We get a considerable quantity of fruit, but that is all. The fact is that from places round Melbourne, such as East Brighton to Mordialloc and this Whittlesea line where fruit and vegetables are grown, we get very little traffic. They drive right into Melbourne. Do you think these replies require any modification?—No, but I believe that we will get more of the fruit traffic to carry, as we could land it at this intermediate stations without any difficulty, but what the Department had in view was this, that having a service already for goods traffic into Melbourne, it was not fair that we should take any of that traffic and credit it to those suburban lines, and I think agree with that.

3100. Do you know this proposal of Mr. Remick’s: it is a sort of intermediate scheme—[describing the same]?—I think there is no justification for such a line. If we are to have a connection
through Collingwood at all; it ought to come as laid down on the plan. It would be of no utility to the district, and that is a district really and truly that is deserving of a railway connection.

3101. I do not know whether you give any preference, if only one line is to be constructed?—No. I said it would be a great pity to spend money in making those connections when the probability was that you would find you would have to duplicate the lines, while at the same time one line would not give the assistance to develop the suburban and country traffic that the two lines would.

3102. Suppose we could only construct one line?—If it were only a question of calling for tenders for one line before the other, I would say the Collingwood; but I say it would be a great pity, as to these two lines that could be constructed without loss to the country and would give such enormous assistance to the community, that either the one or the other should be dropped.

3103. There is a scheme shown here on the plan, coloured yellow, called Millane's scheme?—Mr. Millane allowed me this scheme about five months ago, but I would not like to express an opinion on it.

3104. If a scheme such as that could be carried out, giving a service for Collingwood and Fitzroy at the same cost as for the one only?—It would not suit us at all working in Flinders-street.

3105. We have now arrived at a solution of the Flinders-street station which, I hope, will enable us to work those suburban lines through Flinders-street in the most economical way possible; therefore I say that an arrangement by Mr. Millane's would not suit our proposed working.

3105. As to the land compensation: you think if the route were decided on you would get the land for the money the estimates are based on?—That is a matter that is outside the Commissioner's province. Now, the Engineer-in-Chief is practically under the Minister, and while his estimates have been supplied to me for submission to the Committee, still I have no evidence as to whether the values that have been put upon them are sufficient or not, farther than that I asked the Chief Engineer, and he said that he thought he had made every reasonable allowance for compensation.

3106. By Mr. Prowse. Talking of Millane's scheme: is that scheme practicable in your opinion? There are, not advantages in connection with it that it has central stations; then it puts the people down in the same way as the tramways do, at a larger number of points in the city than any of your proposed routes?—It is nearer the centre of the city, and it has those advantages, but I question whether (as I understand it is an overhead line) it would be allowed to be built through the streets of Melbourne.

3107. That is another question entirely: I should like your opinion on the other point, all other things being equal?—I would not give us the facilities which our other lines at our Flinders-street station will give; it would not work in. Besides, it terminates at Spencer-street. Spencer-street is practically only our country traffic station, and it is getting every day more so, because all the trains will ultimately run into Flinders-street except a few of the more important country trains that we cannot accommodate there, where we deal with a lot of luggage and impediments of that kind.

3108. By Mr. Burton. Have you made up your mind that there must be two lines to carry out the scheme you have laid down?—Yes.

3109. You are not inclined to modify that idea at all?—No. I think it would be cheaper to build the two schemes now; that it would work to so well with other arrangements that for the mere sum of money that we think we might be behind with the Fitzroy line it would be far more than compressed by building the two lines.

3110. You have signed the Appendices "A" and "B" in the papers submitted to the Committee. Your estimate as to the Collingwood line, there would be a surplus of £660 after allowing for working expenses and interest?—Yes.

3111. Have you any reason to modify that opinion now?—Yes. I think it is only fair to say that the basis on which the figures were made up for the Collingwood and Fitzroy lines I think the Fitzroy was not credited with the population and the revenue of a portion of Collingwood that lies nearer to that line.

3112. Take Collingwood for the present. After reading all the evidence that has been given to the Committee, do you think that £640 credit is likely to be the result if this line is constructed?—I think it will not be lost—of course it may be more.

3113. You think, substantially, that may stand?—Yes.

3114. Appendix "B"—you estimate there, and you signed it, that you expect that the loss on that will be £5,600?—Yes.

3115. How much do you think you would be inclined to modify your opinion as to that?—I am inclined to think, by the way in which the figures were arrived at as to Collingwood and Fitzroy, that Fitzroy probably would get an amount of the traffic that was credited to Collingwood, and therefore probably about £2,000 would be deducted from the Collingwood line and credited to Fitzroy, or rather that the Fitzroy instead of a loss of £5,600, would show a low of only £3,800. And I go further and say that the assets that will be realisable on the surplus property we will have will be enough to pay us that deficit on the Fitzroy line, so I believe if the two lines are constructed there will not be a deficit, but that they will reduce materially the losses on the lines with which they will be connected.

3116. You think your estimate of loss on the two lines of £5,600 was not an accurate estimate?—It was as far as it went, but there were certain circumstances that have come to my knowledge now that I did not have then. These figures were supplied by the Department, and after going over them with the officers, I had reason to believe that they were fixed on a reasonable basis. But certain facts have come to my knowledge since, the one about the surplus properties; and also that the Fitzroy line would be nearer a portion of the Collingwood population than the Collingwood would be, and therefore it is fair to Fitzroy that they should get credit for the traffic. You cannot state absolutely what the traffic will be for either line because you cannot precisely fix the boundary line between Fitzroy and Collingwood.

3117. There is a given volume of traffic, and it has to be divided in certain proportions?—Precisely, and my officers and I only put in to assume that the Collingwood traffic as shown here should be credited to the Collingwood line, and I say now it is only fair, as a certain proportion would probably use the Fitzroy line as it would be nearer to their residences, that the Fitzroy line should be credited with it, but it is impossible to draw a line exactly as to how much it would be. It would be about a fair thing to divide it, and I have said that the Collingwood line would lose nothing by being credited with that, because I think those figures given in are rather under than over estimated, and there is ample margin to fully realise them.
315. As a rivet, you think there is none at present, and not likely to be, between the tram and the railway?—I am not aware of any.
316. Did you ever come from England to Western Australia?—Yes.
317. Do you agree to the information, that there was no material cutting shot, nor traffic loss near 40 per cent?—Yes.
318. You have not had an increase of cost?—We have not increased a single shilling since 1894.
319. You have earned that amount extra with the same train?—Yes.
320. And still there is a loss?—Yes. You can build lines that will never give any favorable result because of the original expences.
321. And you can take 1,500,000 passengers at the same cost that you took formerly 600,000?
—Yes.
322. The amount you credit here for the carriage of cargo and sandhicks is £1,000 on each of these lines, does that refer to payable goods and mud goods delivered?—No, it refers, particularly, to the ordinary parcel traffic, not dealing with the fruit trade at all, because the Traffic Manager said they had not billed it to any fruit traffic on these lines.
323. Not payable parcels of fruit?—No.
324. What does the £1,000 mean?—It is for the general parcels traffic coming to the various stations on the line.
325. And does not include what you said would be encumbered by this traffic?—Yes.
326. By the lots of Coffee.—You said you were not in favor of having a station at the cricket ground?—I do not think it would be desirable, for the reason that it would simply suit the people going to perhaps twenty matches in the season, and it would cause the whole residential population to walk the extra distance for the season.
327. I suppose you have an idea of the size of the gathering there?—Yes.
328. I bet for the people coming in from the southward to be carried into Melbourne or get out to Richmond and have to walk a mile?—It might be a convenience to have a station nearer the cricket ground, but I do not think it would justify the expense of putting one down.
329. Say people from St. Kilda and Williamstown, and on the North-Eastern line, should they have to get and bear the expense of going by tram?—They will be served by this line, as it goes within 300 yards of the cricket ground.
330. Do not you think that a population of 70,000 or 80,000 people at Collingwood should have the convenience of getting as near a place of amusement as possible?—They will be very close. If you lay down a law that for every place of amusement there is to be station accommodation it will be very difficult.
331. You make them pay one-cent and they pay?—Some of them do not pay. I am getting out a list of them.
332. Should people be forced to get out at Richmond and walk a mile when they would be dropped at the door, and the train service loses a bag passenger traffic?—I think there is a bigger question behind it than that. Should the whole of the 30,000,000 general passengers travelling to and from Melbourne be inconveniently put down at the cricket ground to save a few people walking half-a-mile? Of course we are anxious to encourage the people to travel on the trains.
333. At present they have to be walked from Melbourne to Richmond; why should that be?—They got me down now very conveniently. It would not pay the Department to have any expense in putting a station down opposite the cricket ground. The amount of money it would cost to provide accommodation there would be something considerable, and it would disarrange every set of trains running over those six lines. If special trains were put down you could not make it; you would block those six lines.
334. There is no arrangement to the service at Richmond when they stop there?—But there are six lines at Richmond. You would have to build six platforms at the cricket ground and get in a shed for carrying those people twenty times a year. To carry 20,000 people at 1d. a head it would not pay the grate.
335. Has not the public a right to be studied?—That is what we are born for.
336. Should the people have it walk a mile?—If we could accommodate them we would be very glad to do it.
337. You said you were not in favor of a line going to the lower portion of the cricket ground. In your area a big population on the northeast of Richmond they would be served?—Richmond has a station now and they will have a station at the corner of this line [pointing to the plan].
338. What is the distance in going the way you propose compared with what I speak of?—I suppose it would lengthen the line about half-a-mile to go to the south of the cricket ground, and between the cricket ground and Collingwood place a quarter of a mile. That would not serve the residential population, but leave that line to the trains as now.
339. By Mr. Treasurer.—How far are you now from the cricket ground?—Not more than 10 chains.
340. How far is it from the Williamstown station to the cricket ground?—About half-a-mile.
341. Does the line to the Royal Agricultural Society pay?—I cannot say.
342. Does the Flemington line pay?—I am thinking there that just now.
343. There are several lines that have looped lines to other places, they generally pay?—I would not like to make a statement about that. I am inquiring just now into the whole question.
344. By Mr. J. S. White.—You said just now you did not think it would pay to construct a line close to the cricket ground?—That was, of the present plan.
345. You speak about the residents about Collingwood and so on. Do you think the people there will travel by your railway on this Collingwood line?—Yes, because the people want to go through Melbourne to other places. The people living near Collingwood will still walk through the park, but people wanting to go out to Epsom and North Melbourne and Footscray, So., it will give direct communication right through.
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3151. You think it is more for the suburban traffic than the Melbourne?—It is not for the city traffic but for residential population either beyond Flinders-street or into the suburbs on the other side. I do not believe that people from this station would travel into Collins-street by it.

3152. If the tramways think fit to give a transfer at Swanston-street and Elizabeth-street to go up the city you can get any traffic at all. They will have to compete.—Yes, I do not think it is certain, proportion of the traffic under any circumstances for people that are travelling with periodical tickets. Their business lies beyond Melbourne, and they will take a periodical ticket.

3153. I speak of the people at Jolimont—will any people there travel into the city of Melbourne by your tram?—I think so. The tramway system there runs along Flinders-street, and surely if they build from Flinders-street we could do the same. Everybody is not wanting a transfer from Elizabeth-street up. There are a great number of the warehouses there by Flinders-street. We built them as Elizabeth-street, Flinders-street, and Queen-street.

3154. If the Tram Company say they have not got twenty a day to travel is that portion of the city of Melbourne would they be correct?—No, they would not. I know, because I have travelled a hundred times from Jolimont, and I have seen twenty people leave the train at that portion for the city of Melbourne. They do not go as far as Spencer-street. In one time they get thousands of people through the trains that we will carry through with our trains.

3155. If the trains give a transfer and deliver people in any part of the city, and lower the fare from Jolimont to Jol., that is, sectional fare you still think it will be better to have the station there than have one going direct through the streets?—I do not think that will ever occur.

3156. Not the penny section?—No, not that. I am surprised the citizens of Melbourne have put up for so long without having that.

3157. You condemn the connexion from Fairfield Park to Northcote-bridge because the people would get out at the North Fitzroy station?—Yes.

3158. In Heidelberg much further to Spencer-street or Flinders-street then Brighton to Flinders-street?—We run from Heidelberg trains in 23 minutes.

3159. They could not complain at that?—At the time we propose running it in is 25 minutes.

3160. But, I mean going round by this connexion through Spencer-street?—I could not give an answer to that without going into it. It takes 48 minutes at present.

3161. You know the Outer Circle line that is not running now?—Yes.

3162. It was intended to connect from Fairfield Park to Northcote-bridge?—There is no necessity for that line for the Gippesland traffic. If the Collingwood line were built through Flinders-street we could work the traffic through Collingwood and go to Spencer-street without going to the expense of £20,000 or £30,000 to build this loop.

3163. Would it be desirable to build it?—No, I think they should continue the Collingwood line through. I say there is no necessity for spending money on that connexion at all now. In that arrangement Collingwood would be left out entirely. There has been a great deal of money spent on the Collingwood line. This would deprive us from using that station as a passenger station altogether, and it would be another loss leaving that line doing nothing but goods traffic.

3164. You said if we constructed only one line you think the Collingwood line should be chosen. Why?—I said if we were merely a question of calling for tenders for the one contract it advances the other.

3165. Suppose the Committee said they would agree to one line only?—I said I thought it would be a great mistake to do anything of the kind, because it would not enable us to give a service to the district, and utilise our present service through Flinders-street.

3166. Then your answer is, we cannot construct the two we had better constuct none at all?—I would not say that, but I say it is hardly fair to put it that way, because I think that both lines are equally entitled to the completion that they ask now. Of course they must bow to the will of Parliament, and I can only express my opinion.

3167. By Mr. Horrie.—You nearly answer the question put. In the event of only one line being recommended by the Committee, which of the two lines would you favour?—I do not think it is a fair question to ask, I say both should be built.

3168. Is it that you are indifferent which it should be?—No. I feel to construct only one would be a great misfortune, but if it were only a question of calling for tenders I would say Collingwood first. The Collingwood line is a line where the people now have no proper through service, and we could do better with that line than the Fitzroy. There is nothing between the two, because to do full justice to the station at Flinders-street and the service there we want both lines.

3169. If the Committee recommended only one line, which of the two would be best, if they cannot construct both?—I am afraid I cannot answer that.

3170. By Mr. J. S. White.—You say you expect to receive a certain amount of surplus rent or the properties for the lines?—Yes.

3171. Do you propose to purchase more than you want for the stations?—We will not take so much more that we want absolutely, and if the property owners are willing to treat us as taking one-half of a building and we the other half we will be willing to treat, but there are persons who force you to take the whole. As to these buildings, we expect we will have a revenue from those, and will be able to utilize them by selling them or letting them, and I believe the revenue from those, in the course of time, will be a great assistance towards any deficit on the Fitzroy line.

3172. In your valuations going through that matter, have you taken into account any more than you require for your absolute use?—The Engineer-in-Chief is under the direction, and if you wish any information of that kind you ought to ask him.

3173. Unless you propose to purchase more land than you require there will be nothing to come from that source of revenue?—I was assured by the Engineer-in-Chief that he has made ample provision for compensation.

3174. Has he said the amount of revenue you expect to get outside that?—We are not going to let the properties so domine.

3175. In getting the revenue you calculate the population—do you expect an increase of population in the northern suburbs?—Yes.
3176. People are leaving the colony and do you still expect a large population?—The basis on which the figures were arrived at was the present traffic. In Appendix "A" for the Collingwood line, it says—"Estimated revenue is arrived at as follows:—Population of district, 37,000; reckoning 57 journeys per head of population at 1d. (the average rate on Preston line), £134,492; parcels and luggage traffic, £1,000; present traffic on Heidelberg line to Clifton Hill and Collingwood, and vice versa, 300,000 passengers per annum; assuming 65 per cent. of these will go on to terminus, at 1d., £1,250; add 50 per cent. for increased traffic, consequent on direct route and more frequent service, £525; 'foreign' bookings, 65 per cent. of 'local' revenue, £4,474; total, £20,771." I have already explained, and I want to point out that none of the figures were got up by the Department. In any return I have to get out I have to rely on my officials. I do not profess to know all the details—I know the subject only generally; but these are the actual figures.

3177. We will have to discount your evidence to that extent?—Yes, I have every reason to believe that these figures are absolutely correct, and they can be verified on figures that can be got at a moment's notice. But my evidence is subject to the question of local knowledge of the district to be served.

3178. You merely calculate for the population there now?—Yes, and the additional traffic on those lines by giving a continuous service.

3179. Your fares are lower than on the southern lines; you calculate 1½d.?—Yes.

3180. Can you give the reason why the fare from Albert Park to Spencer-street is 10s., and from Albert Park to Coburg is 3s. 6d. monthly? You make them a present of 6s., and carry them from Spencer-street to Coburg for nothing?—I do not think we have any of them to carry from Albert Park to Coburg; you refer to a periodical monthly ticket. I cannot tell you the reason for that. It is probably twenty years old for all I know.

3181. We expect the same consideration from the Government because we are all contributors to the railway revenue. Why do you carry them cheaper on the southern suburbs than the north?—I believe there have been a great many things done in the past that we could not very well justify; but these are anomalies we are proposing to get rid of.

3182. Do you propose in future to charge only for mileage?—We are going to try and make the best arrangements we can.

3183. By Mr. Harris.—You said if both lines were constructed there would be a prospect of making them pay "within a reasonable time"; what do you call a reasonable time?—As soon as the lines are opened, I am satisfied there will be a considerable reduction in the loss the first year; but of course, it is impossible to say to what extent.

3184. Within a couple of years will it be wiped out?—I would not like to predict that.

3185. I understand from your evidence there is not as much done as might be in running the through trains from one suburb to another?—I did not say that. What I said was, there was not as much done as there would be if you gave us these two lines.

3186. Did you read what Mr. Eddy said in Sydney as to that particular question before the Railways Committee?—I did read his evidence. What is the point?

3187. Do you agree with Mr. Eddy's views as expressed in reply to the Hon. D. Melville (page 8)?—What Mr. Eddy refers to is the dealing with the suburban traffic through Flinders-street, and what I have been endeavouring to explain to the Committee to-day is that those suburban trains running on the one side of the city will not in future terminate at Flinders-street, but will run through, and the terminal of the trains will be on the outskirts of the city instead of in the centre, therefore I said there will be a saving to the country in providing terminal accommodation at Flinders-street, which would meet to a large extent the money required for paying the interest on those lines.

3188. As to Mr. Milligan's scheme, my impression was that you dismissed that rather too lightly. You said his ran to Spencer-street. Your own proposal ran to Spencer-street!—But it does not suit the working in the way we have arranged. Our train service is to run through Flinders-street. His scheme would not enable us to work the service as we propose at all.

3189. If his scheme were adopted, and you re-arranged the whole of your matters, would it not be more beneficial to the public than your proposed scheme?—I do not think so. It would not be as suitable as ours, looking to the fact that we are joining the country lines to the southern lines at Flinders-street.

3190. Have not the success of the trams and the deficiency on the railways been caused by the fact that the trains are more convenient?—The trains certainly lift and put the people down at their various residences which the railways do not, and in that respect the trains are more convenient for short distance traffic than the railways, but I cannot admit that the trains are more convenient for the general public than the trains are.

3191. By the Hon. E. Morey.—What would it cost to put a platform on the main line to serve the Melbourne Cricket Ground?—You cannot do it without a stadium—you must have bridges—you have six sets of trams to deal with there.

3192. Carry a platform; you will not want a staff there except at the time of the sports.—It means a great deal more than that.

3193. By Mr. Harris.—Will you ascertain what has been the cost of the present viaduct and what would be the cost of erecting another similar one in Flinders-street?—I will supply that.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to to-morrow, at eleven o'clock.
3194. By the Chairman.—Will you state the particular advantages of the line you propose over any other line that has been proposed—? If your contention that it will be more central, and will distribute the population of the northern area through the city better than any other route will do?—Yes. The first point I claim is that it will bring the people direct to the heart of the city, which the other schemes do not do. Mr. Clapp, the Managing Director of the Tramways Company, told you that the reason railways could not compete with the tramways was that the railways brought the people to the city and the trams took them into it. When Mr. McVille said that my scheme would land the people close to the Post Office he feared away from it; but that is the keynote of the whole of my scheme. We are laying down our railways at present so as to give us a very inconvenient railway system for Melbourne and suburbs for all time—the people are brought to the south-east corner of the city instead of into it. The portion coloured green on the map is all reserved, and you can see at a glance that the city cannot extend to the seaward; as it develops it will do so to the north and west, and when we are laying down our railways we ought to look at the future as well as the present. I contend that to bring all the traffic from the 120 stations that there are within a radius of 10 miles of Melbourne and deposit it on the outer edge of the city is a huge mistake. The situation is this: the suburbs are very close together; some are within a block of a mile of one another—and after collecting people from all points in the suburbs you drop them down on the side of the Yarra. Melbourne is only a large workshop, and any one would admit it is a mistake to land all the workers on the south side—bringing them to the city is simply inundating the northern portion of Melbourne. Since I gave my evidence the other day, the people of Brunnick-street and to the north are waking up to the importance of the matter—they see that you are going to take away their trade. The tram that runs down Brunnick-street brings people in from Clifton Hill, Nicholas-street, and North Fitzroy. You expect to bring these people who now use the trams into town by rail, and you propose to drop them in the south-eastern corner of the city. That means taking away the business of the people in Brunnick-street from Spring-street to Spencer-street, and all the people to the north. I think that is not fair. Again, the majority of the people in Fitzroy and Collingwood are mechanics, and want to come to their work in the morning into the city; and you find the factories and work-shops are to the north of Brunnick-street, it is a life of workers; but you drop these people at Prince's-bridge, forcing them to walk to the northern portion of the city in the morning and back again at night—that is the reason your railways will not pay. You have made an outer circle on the north and west, and now you are going to make another on the south and east. It is absurd to drop all the people on the south as if you were to take all the people down the south and drop them on the north. I cannot see why Collingwood and the people to the north of Brunnick-street should not be considered as well as the few people about Fitzroy. You have been told that the business is done in Flinders-street, but that is because you take all the people there and instead of giving the city freedom to grow and develop you are cramming it—it is like trying to grow a gum tree in a flower pot. If you take the line along Lygon-street, with a station near the Post Office and another at the Rialto Schools, you will create new centres for business to develop and grow. Taking my station near the Post Office as the centre of a circle with a half-mile radius, that practically includes the whole of Melbourne, but taking Prince's-bridge as the centre of a circle with the same radius you will see that it only includes about one-third of the city; the life is parks and gardens, from which you cannot expect to get any traffic. Again, I may call attention to the reason why the trams are taking it so rough for the Brunswick line. The Brunswick line is leading people into the wrong place; it is taking them down to the Yarra bank, whereas their employment is principally in the factories and foundries to the north of Brunnick-street, and when they come from their work at night they are not much in the humour to walk half-a-mile to Flinders-street, so they jump into the tram. My line does not stop at Spencer-street; the Coburg train will come into Spencer-street and curve into Lygon-street, through the central station, continuing on to Preston or Heidelberg. By that means you will bring the Brunswick people into the heart of Melbourne, and then you will see there will be a difference in the takings. I venture to say that the Tram Company will not then run in opposition, because if you bring people into the centre of the city you give them a greater advantage than they have in the trams. You bring them into the heart of the city, and you also give them the opportunity of getting out in the west or the east.

3195. A great point is made of having through lines from Essendon and Williamstown—your way of getting a through line is by going round by Spencer-street, and then coming east to Flinders-street?—Yes, if it is necessary; but our traffic has not been in that direction.

3196. Yours would not be a through traffic unless you desired to go round by Spencer-street?—The first problem that we have to solve is the accommodation of the regular passengers who travel night and morning; the occasional traveller will look after himself. The people from Coburg and Brunswick I land in the heart of Melbourne, and I give them three stations to reflect them. The Coburg train will come into Spencer-street, then go along Lygon-street, with a chimney, to the Post Office; then along the Model Schools; then along the Victoria-parade through Collingwood, Clifton Hill, and on to Heidelberg.

3197. By Mr. Corner.—You would run the trams backwards and forwards between Coburg and Heidelberg?—Yes. Then the Williamstown town tram could also run the same way, giving people an opportunity of getting out either at Spencer-street or at the central station.

3198. By the Chairman.—Would the Williamstown town train come into your lines by a sweep or a loop?—It would come on an ordinary curve.

3199. Would that curve into Lygon-street come into Flinders-street?—No; people wishing to go to Flinders-street would have to change trams. The Traffic Manager could arrange that—it is a matter
of detail. He would say—"We will clip those trains. No, I train will go on to Finsbury-square, and it requires no further consideration. No, 2 will go through the heart of Melbourne."  

2800. By Mr. Green.—One lot of trains from Williamstown will go on the entire course and sweep to the central station, and another lot will not go that way at all—they will go to Finsbury-square.—Yes, if it is necessary. A person would not think that train would look at the timetables, nor whether a particular line was going in the direction he desired.  

2801. Are you going to have any connection with the southern suburbs?—No, they are connected at Spencer-street.  

2802. By Mr. Trentham.—Your conclusion is that the northern suburbs will be served very much better by your proposal than by any of the other proposals that have been made, and, in addition to that, the southern trams will be taken into the centre of the city much better than it is now. Coming from Brighton and Williamstown people can go to Spencer-street and round into Lanark-street?—If necessary we can do so, but we do not propose to do that—these lines are connected for the purposes of the rolling-stock.  

2803. If a person were coming from Brighton it would not pay him to go round by your line—it would pay him better to get out at Finsbury-square and walk up 200 yards. Of course it would. The next point is that the whole of my scheme can be constructed for over £200,000 less than the other schemes. I will bring in the two lines for the rest of one, and bring them in on better paying routes. As a proof of my statement, you will see that my lines follow the main tracks. There is a tram-track going down Menzies-parade and there my line is taken above the canal bank. I examined that yesterday, the other day, and the people think so little of it that it is not unlooked for, and from all appearances in my years since we were here.  

2804. By Mr. Green.—Mr. Clapp said the company might as well pull up the Nicholson-street line—have done that affect you?—That is right into my line.  

2805. Would not the fact that that tramway is not needed affect your railway in the same way?—No, I want to get at the back country. It is: not a matter of providing Finsbury with railway communication, but I would not trouble with, it but it is the country beyond Finsbury that I think we should try to get at, and if Mr. Clapp would like to abandon the line through Nicholson-street there can be no objection to our using it.  

2806. Your gathering ground on the plan comes west of Nicholson-street as far as Lygon-street?—Yes, nearly to the conservatory.  

2807. Are you certain that you will pick up all that traffic?—I believe that the people on the west side of Lygon-street would use the Nicholson-street station. The regular travellers would use the station at Nicholson-street, Reilly-street, and the Carlton Gardens. It has been said that my line would be as good to the people of Fitzroy. Fitzroy is half-a-mile wide, I come down Queen's-parade along Reilly-street; I give the people of Fitzroy a station at the corner of Nicholson-street and Reilly-street. The next station is to the corner of the Carlton Gardens, also on the boundary of Fitzroy. Then there is a station at the north-west corner of Ely-street, and another at the north-east corner, so I cannot see what Fitzroy has to grumble at when I give them four stations besides the one they already have in the course.  

2808. By Mr. J. S. White.—Where is the nearest station to the one at the Model Schools?—At the end of Nicholson-street, about half-a-mile away.  

2809. Do you think people will come from Lygon-street to that station to go into the city?—If I lived to the north of Alexandra-parade in North Carlton and wished to come into the city, I would go across to the station at Reilly-street; if I lived near Ball and Wellesl, I would go to the station at the Carlton Gardens.  

2810. By Mr. Trentham.—Do you think that you would do that when the tram is so convenient?—Yes; by taking the tram I save £4 7s. 4d. per return, travelling second class, as compared with the tram.  

2811. But by going from Ball and Wellesl to the Carlton Gardens corner you would have quite half-a-mile to walk, whereas you would only have 100 yards to walk to get a tram—would you walk half-a-mile 600 times in a row to save £4 7s. 4d.? Half-a-mile is nothing—a man walks more than that every day for exercise. I leave three stations within 15 chains of the principal street in Fitzroy, Brunswick-street. You have been told that Smith-street is the most important street out of Melbourne; I have one station at the bottom of that street, which will also accommodate Fitzroy, so I do not see what Fitzroy has to grumble at. My scheme will also have a larger gathering ground for the Collingwood line than the Young-street line. The Young-street line is practically only half-a-mile from the Collingwood line, so that it must rub that line. That I think Carlton should be considered as well as Fitzroy—there is a perfect gemini of tramsides and railways in Fitzroy already.  

2812. By Mr. J. S. White.—Then why do you suggest making another one?—I want to get at the back country, and I must come in through Fitzroy or Carlton. The reason for making the lines at all is that the lodging at the present time on the existing tram service is equal to 200 miles a day of unnecessary travelling, which is just as if you travelled from Melbourne to Bendigo and back every day for nothing. This is why I want more lines and when we are making lines I counsel that Carlton ought to be served as well as Fitzroy. The people north of Brunswick-street are a matter of a railway service as well as the people to the south of it. Some people have found fault with my central station because it is elevated, but the Government proposals for the next lines have you four elevated stations, or rather four and half, because one or partly elevated and partly in a cutting, and, as far as I can see, those stations are looked in very bad places on the Young-street line. The first station is little garden, and you will not get much traffic there. You will get a few others coming from the northern suburbs in the morning, and the rest of the day you will get practically nothing, and you would not pay the porters' wages. The next station, at Gertrude-street, is in the mouth of a tunnel, with very bad approaches.  

2813. By Mr. Trentham.—Will not the station in Young-street be in the centre of a tram populous district?—I am not thinking in Melbourne, but in Carlton—the greatest portion of the people go inside to work, but in Fitzroy and Collingwood they do not; the factories are there. The station in Gertrude-street is at the mouth of a tunnel, and it is not much more than a mile from the terminus. No person would want to go there, so dropped off at Prince's-bridge unless he wanted to go to Brunswick or some of those places. If a tram was just going and a man wanted to go down somewhere
near Prince's-bridge he would take it, but the majority of those people want to go to Boro-street and Collins-street. Thus, again, by making my line, if a young fellow wants to go into the theatre of an evening he can get into the train at Clifton Hill and be stopped close in the theatre.

3211. By Mr. Croker.—How much of your scheme will be in tunnels?—Only about 37 chains.

3212. Will you have as much as possible underground as there is any of the other schemes?—The Railway Department have opening 72 chains—I have 101 chains; they have covered cutting 18 chains—I have 36 chains; they have covered cutting by roads and bridges 16 chains—I have 22 chains; they have tunnel 21 chains, and I have only covered cutting.

3213. That is practically a tunnel?—Not in the cost, though it is the same to the passengers. They have high level 171 chains—I have 168 chains.

3214. By the Hon. E. Morley.—What would be the difference in the cost of working your line as compared with the other?—I should say they would be about the same practically.

3215. Have you made any estimate of what it would cost to work those overhead stations?—No; no doubt the Railway Department could give that; it would be the same in both cases.

3216. The cost of working goes on for all time, and if your scheme costs 25 or 30 per cent, more for all time, that is a big consideration?—There are about the same number of stations in each case, so there cannot be much difference between them. They have 68 chains of embankment and I have 38 chains; they have six stations and I have six; they have four and a half stations on the high level and I have four. In addition to that I give stations in the centre of the city. This station at the Model Schools can be made into one of the best in the country for milk and butter and perishable goods. The station is partly underground, and you can have cool chambers for your meat requiring piecers. Another point is the immense quantity of land lying waste in Victoria-terms; it is about a mile long by about 50 chains wide; write that you can have practically a continuous goods station for the whole of the district, and you can see that it would be an immense advantage for Fitzroy and Collingwood to have a station like that.

3217. By Mr. Croker.—Would you pick up my heavy traffic in Victoria-terms?—There is the Victoria Brevity, which could have a siding run right into it. There is the Fosters Lager Beer Company on the other side of the street, and there is the Victoria Malting Company. There is the Melbourne & Sydney Railway within a stone's throw, and there is also Foy and Gibson's, which would be benefited by the station in Yonge-street, and my line is not half so far away from it. I have a station at the end of Smith-street, about 23 chains from Foy and Gibson's.

3218. By Mr. J. S. White.—How far from Foy and Gibson's are you in Victoria-street?—About 35 chains.

3219. By the Hon. E. Morley.—Are not bicycles a large extent taking the place of railways and tramways?—No, though they are very good for management.

3220. By Mr. Croker.—Mr. Ronick gives this evidence.—This proposition of Mr. Millane's proposes to accumulate as many people as the other two lines, and it can be done for the cost that it would take to construct the cheaper of the other two lines. Of course you cannot give any opinion as to that?—So, only I know that it was proposed in the years long ago and that also was rejected on its merits. That project was also before the first Standing Committee?—It was never rejected on its merits; it was never honoured properly. Mr. Mathieson said yesterday that I submitted this matter to him fully twelve months ago, but he has only been six months in the county; I cannot see how that can be. When I submitted it to him, he looked at it carefully and he said—"You know I am a stranger here." I said—"Yes, I wish to bring under your notice this matter; it is a matter which I am very familiar with, in fact I do not believe there is a man in Melbourne who has given more attention to it than I have." He went into the matter and after hearing all I had to say he said—"Looking at it on the face it looks good, but I am a stranger here and I do not know whether there are any engineering difficulties in the road. There may be something is it that a stranger cannot know." I said—"I have the plans and sections; I have not gone into it with my eyes shut." After that he said the best thing I could do was to bring it before the Committee. He said—"Is there any reason why you could not bring the Brunswick line into Nicholson-street?" I said—"Now, except the cost." I pointed out to him the lines as laid down nearly twenty years ago going from Brunswick, and the other going up the Fitzgerald road.

3221. By Ronick's evidence goes on at question 124.—Mr. Millane says he can construct either of those two for less than the other because there is no land to be purchased?—I would not say as to that. Has not a lot of your land to be purchased?—Yes. What would be the difference?—Mine would be cheaper as it would not obstruct the Godding. It would be cheaper if so brick arches and I would have to build no bridge to put up light pillars, with a steel superstructure." What have you to say to that?—It will not obstruct the traffic at all. In Flinders-street the pillars of the viaduct are within 15 feet of the street where the Godding boats come in, and the Department will have to construct two or three more viaducts along Flinders-street to carry the traffic.

3222. Is yours to be a continuous steel viaduct?—Yes.

3223. Is that more expensive than brick arches?—I do not think so. The cost of the viaduct in Flinders-street was about £120,000 for three-quarters of a mile; my estimate does not come out anything like that cost. For the former Committee I got the assistance of Mr. London, a civil engineer, to go over the ground with me, and see that I was not making any mistake. We took the quantities together, and I have the sections showing the grades and elevations. I went round to the leading foundries in Melbourne and got prices for the work, and on that we formed our estimates. Mr. London gives me estimates of £5; I took the usual railways of America as our guides. This is the evidence Mr. London gave.—Will you describe the style and class of viaduct you proposed to have?—The one used on the New York elevated roads. The working drawings and specification and full information of that erected road is given in several want 68 of the Institution of Civil Engineers. In making the estimates, I checked that by making a drawing of the heavier work. Their engine are only 12 tons. I designed this to carry the 40-ton engines. In addition to that, I have a narrower space. I adopted the lattice-work style of construction for the pillars.

3224. Do you approve the elevated railway of New York on wooden trestles?—No; but that is a matter of detail. It was not a wooden one that we took the drawings from; it was a steel one.
Mr. Lunnon's evidence goes on—"Wrought iron—all steel; that is, four posts connected by lattice work. No cast iron at all!—No; the foundations of the columns would be fixed to the brickwork by cast-iron sockets. There would be no tensile strain on that at all. These are the details of the New York elevated road. The foundation is 2½ feet wide; that is the max. course over; 16 feet high from the road to the bottom of the way; there are 4 spars, all lattice-work, open at the bottom, so there is no obstruction to the light. The foundations are brick, with a cast-iron shoe fixed to the brickwork, and the permanent way per mile is £55,000; that works out to about £32 per ton fixed in position. I designed a more solid structure. The station cost £12,000 per mile; that comes altogether at £750 per chain, that is, on the New York elevated, to carry a 12-ton engine. In calculating the weights of the structure I proposed to build. I took a 40-ton engine, which is a small engine for Victoria; the big engines are about 70 tons. My structure would not take these. I designed a heavier structure for this 40-ton engine, which meant more steel; I calculated £42 10s. per ton."
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2945. By Mr. E. Morley.—In case of either line being chosen, whichever one, what would it cost to connect to run right through to Spencer-street from Flinders-street?—You mean over the viaduct?

2946. Yes.—I find that the cost of the present viaduct was approximately £100,000. The cost of duplicating that would be approximately £50,000; we have all the land on which to duplicate it.

2947. By Mr. Burton.—Would it be necessary to duplicate?—Another line connecting with this traffic it will be absolutely necessary. The present service over that viaduct is a train every four minutes each way; in busy times it is perhaps a train every three minutes. So, though we add our block sections train lengths, as it were, it will be absolutely necessary to duplicate that viaduct in order to work the service both north and south of the city.

2948. By the Chairman.—You think that will be necessary in a very short time, whether additional lines come in on Flinders-street or not?—It will be absolutely necessary, sooner or later, because we are proposing to extend the accommodation at Spencer-street goods station to enable us to set there with the coal traffic from the Flinders mines, and the traffic which is now accommodated in the Flinders-street yard will be sent through to Spencer-street. We hope to increase that traffic so very large extent, and we are going to a very considerable expense in building goods and hopper trucks, hoping to assist the producers of the colonial coal by the extra facilities we give him to deal with his product.

2949. By Mr. Crewe.—As a matter of fact are there three girders to lay the main girders simply half completed, or is such a way that you have, only to add on the other portion of the approaches for duplication?—They have all been built with the idea that duplication will come in time.

2950. In fact, the east side is not completed.—Yes, and the central girder is built to take in the central girder.

2951. By the Hon. E. Morley.—We have some doubt as to the expense of a station for the cricket ground?—I have gone into that matter, and I find that the cost of giving platforms on the main line opposite the cricket ground would be £20,000, and that the traffic would not pay us to have the accommodation there. There would be an annual loss of probably £1,000 a year, even estimating that we carried 100,000 people. We assume that all we would get for the fare there would be a mere fraction over the present fare, and therefore the amount of money we would derive would not pay interest and working expenses.

2952. There would be no expense except the outlay on the days of playing; one could move the staff away.—I beg your pardon; the whole of the lines would have to be closed round those platforms put for each line, and accommodation provided for standby trains. Assuming there were 20,000 people, so soon as the match was over the whole of them would crowd into the trains, and we could not handle those with the trains passing, and the whole of the service would be damaged for a service that would be practically of little value to the Department. Those matches take place generally on the holidays, when hundreds of good bargain are put on to carry the passenger traffic; and what would it be with 30,000 people extra at fares probably less than 1d. per head for the cricket ground?

2953. I mean work it exactly like it is worked at the Richmond station?—I do not mean that station should be kept open every day, only on certain days when necessary—We have a great many similar places; take even Flemington—we cannot run all the traffic there. People from Williamstown have to run past in the same way. The amount of money we would get we would not regain the Department. The Department have had this matter before them in years gone by, and have considered the question, and the figures they have given me show we would have no profit in the transaction.

2954. I mean that it should be only a single platform, and that it should be for the benefit of people coming from Williamstown or anywhere, that they should get in and out as they do at Richmond?—The bulk of the people would be served by this line along the Wellington-precinct—they would be within 200 yards of it.

2955. A train coming from Williamstown or Footscray, all he would have to do would be to get out of one train, and now he has to take a cab?—He will get that accommodation by this new service. The other would to disarrange the present service for a single day that it would not pay the Department—it would knock the suburban trains out of their ordinary running.

2956. I mean, the ordinary trains should cut as it they do now!—That they must stop to let the people in, and that cannot be done under a loss of three minutes.

2957. For one day in a month it would be a great benefit—it was there when a private company had the railways. There are other places similarly situated, and it would not pay us.

2958. It is done at the race-course?—If they have privileges they are not entitled to, you may take it from me they are not likely to get any more than we can justify it. I do not think the privileges would have been given unless the Departments were satisfied it would pay them. In this case the Department are sure it would not repay them for the outlay.

2959. By Mr. Harris.—The question is whether the game is worth the candle, and you say it is not?—That is just is.

2960. By Mr. Crewe.—Will the station near the cricket ground suit any other than the northern trains?—The station would be within 200 yards of the cricket ground, and there will be no difficulty in running any number of trains there.

2961. I mean from any other suburbs?—People from the Brighton side coming to the Richmond station would still get out at Richmond.
3282. So the people from St. Kilda — Special trains could easily be run straight through on to the Collingwood line.

3283. Trains from St. Kilda, Williamstown, Port Melbourne, and Essendon could run on to this proposed line. — Yes.

3284. But may any one from Hawthorn and those lines would have to get out at Richmond — Yes.

3285. Would there be much difference in handling this traffic as to that to the Caulfield Race course? — That is not a special service, and if a special service is given, we can run it on to the Collingwood line in the same way.

3286. *By the Hon. P. Howie.* — People from Brighton and Frankston would not benefit by it — they would have to come in to Prince’s Bridge and go out again — if they cannot walk from Richmond, they can go to Flemington and take the train back.

3287. *By Mr. Corcoran.* — I think Mr. Remick said you could run a special route from Flemington Street or Prince’s Bridge direct to the cricket ground. There is no difficulty in building a special route, but it would not justify the expense in that case. If a special service is wanted from any part, we can run it to the station on the Collingwood line opposite the cricket ground.

3288. *By the Hon. O. McVicar.* — Do you get the full benefit of the race course traffic, or is there an arrangement with the racing clubs? — We have a special arrangement with the Melbourne Turf Club as to Flemington and also as to Caulfield, and a certain arrangement with the other race courses, Melbourne and those places, which I hope to have next week.

3289. Does that mean that you realise a lot of your takings there? — For the Flemington course we do give the racing clubs a small proportion of the fare that is collected.

3290. Is it a small proportion? — Yes.

3291. You do not complain of the proportion? — No. We see these matters are all under consideration between the various turf clubs and ourselves. I do not wish to make a statement here that we consider right or wrong — of course, we would want an “ounce of Irish.”

3292. *By Mr. Henry.* — At present there are three pairs of rails at Richmond, I think? — Yes.

3293. Is that about ample for the trains that run through there at present? — I have heard no complaints as to want of accommodation there.

3294. Is the road well enough for what is required of it? — I think we could handle more trains than we have now. The fact is I have not gone into the question as to Richmond, but I think we could handle a good many more on the Richmond section. I wish to point out that the six lines of rails at Richmond are not common to the various districts; they run to the one set of rails for a particular district, to do the other two, but the two are common to South Yarra, where we can run trains as we like, but with the Richmond you must set the trains on the right rails at the end of the Flemington station — they cannot cross over at Richmond from one set of rails to the other.

3295. Do you think you would be able to take all the Brighton, Frankston, Geelong, Caulfield, Glen Iris, and Camberwell traffic along with what would come from Preston and Heidelberg over the viaduct at Spencer Street? — There is no arrangement as to the goods trains. We have some of these at present in order to give more accommodation, but there is no doubt to give extra accommodation there.

3296. Is there any ample for the trains that run through there at present? — I have heard no complaints as to want of accommodation there.

3297. In the road well enough for what is required of it? — I think we could handle more trains than we have now. The fact is I have not gone into the question as to Richmond, but I think we could handle a good many more on the Richmond section. I wish to point out that the six lines of rails at Richmond are not common to the various districts; they run to the one set of rails for a particular district, to do the other two, but the two are common to South Yarra, where we can run trains as we like, but with the Richmond you must set the trains on the right rails at the end of the Flemington station — they cannot cross over at Richmond from one set of rails to the other.

3298. Do you think you would be able to take all the Brighton, Frankston, Geelong, Caulfield, Glen Iris, and Camberwell traffic along with what would come from Preston and Heidelberg over the viaduct at Spencer Street? — There is no arrangement as to the goods trains. We have some of these at present in order to give more accommodation, but there is no doubt to give extra accommodation there.

3299. Is there any ample for the trains that run through there at present? — I have heard no complaints as to want of accommodation there.

3300. In the road well enough for what is required of it? — I think we could handle more trains than we have now. The fact is I have not gone into the question as to Richmond, but I think we could handle a good many more on the Richmond section. I wish to point out that the six lines of rails at Richmond are not common to the various districts; they run to the one set of rails for a particular district, to do the other two, but the two are common to South Yarra, where we can run trains as we like, but with the Richmond you must set the trains on the right rails at the end of the Flemington station — they cannot cross over at Richmond from one set of rails to the other.

3301. Should the cost of the extra viaduct be charged to the cost of construction of the Collingwood and Flinders Street lines? — It would not be fair to charge them for any part of it, because that viaduct is necessary for the traffic independently of those lines. In the same way, you would not charge any of the cost of the re-arrangement of Flinders Street Station, because none of the lines that now run there have ever been changed with any of that cost.

3302. What is the railway accommodation at Flemington? — I do not know the arrangement — there are five sets of rails.

3303. You are quite satisfied there is ample room to construct the extra viaduct if necessary? — The engineer-in-chief assured me the land was taken for a double viaduct when the first viaduct was arranged for; and the construction of the first viaduct was practically carried out in such a way that the additional viaduct could be added to it when the time came.

3304. When speaking about the pressure on the railway and the tramways on the Fitzroy and Collingwood lines, I think you said you did not intend to go into my "cut-throat" business? — I have had a meeting with Mr. Capper, and I think it is more than likely that we would understand in disease and arrange matters on a reasonable basis. He and I came to the conclusion that it would be a great waste of public money if we squandered the money in a cut-throat manner, and I think we shall depart from the present spirit of unity. Of course the public interest is the first consideration, and I do not think there is any probability of interests clashing; what we desire is to give the public the conveniences that are demanded by the residents along our lines in the country and in the suburbs.

3305. On what fare do you make your published results? — It is given in the rates, 1 ld., and 1½ d. On the suburban lines it was said that they had reduced the tram fare. I did not know that till I came here, and I was gratified to find that the railways had increased their traffic with a saving of £700 odd, without doing any harm to the Tramway Trust.

3306. You expressed some surprise that the tramways did not adopt penny sections? — Except me, in answer to a question, I expressed surprise that the penny sections had not been adopted, and that the tramway companies had not got many fares. The Melbourne Corporation and others in the vicinity are all largely interested, it is said, in the welfare of the tramway Trust, and, naturally, one would infer that those corporations were interested in the welfare of their citizens; therefore I thought if it was not really a question of money they would have seen that their own citizens had got the conveniences that were given in most cities that have a tramway service such as we have here.
3282. Have you considered the effect on the railway returns if the Port Melbourne tram fares were reduced to 2d. and the Albert Park also?—No, but we are not afraid of any action the tramways Trust may take. Practically if they carried the people for nothing, we are satisfied we would hold our own.

3283. Have you any reason to suppose that the effect in those cases would be different from what it would be on the Ermack line?—I think on the Port Melbourne line it would be altogether in our favour, because the Ermack line goes through a swamp without a residence near it; and, therefore, I think we would be in a far better position to compete with two lines on the Port Melbourne side than on the Coburg. It appears to me, speaking as a stranger, that the Department has not made any special effort there to diminish that traffic, judging by the number of trains.

3284. Do you think it would be possible that the calculations showing the revenue to be derived from Collingwood and Fitzroy would be increased or improved?—If you had a better knowledge of the localities they were to serve—if you had time to go more fully into the matter—I think I stated before that I did not expect my evidence to be taken as any greater value than what it was worth. I said, as to the Fitzroy line, I thought that was the incurring of the revenue from that line, the Department had rather underestimated, with a view of showing they were reaching both lines, as far as they could, on an equitable basis. They have stuck to the municipal boundary, in place of what they might have done—take a line through a corresponding distance from either line and divide the traffic between the two lines. But as against that, it was pointed out that in the northern portion of Collingwood there is a part of Fitzroy that would drop into the Collingwood line, that it would be nearer the Collingwood line than the Fitzroy, and therefore they have taken what they thought was the most equitable basis for the figures that they have arrived at. Then the question arose as to whether the number that they had allocated to the population and the time that the population was to travel was a fair thing, and they showed in comparison with other districts that they had taken a very low average, and one that they thought could be easily justified and maintained, notwithstanding the competition of the trains.

3285. You think that no good purpose could be served by your becoming personally more acquainted with those districts?—I have good traffic officers; and I think the chief officers of the railway are second to none in compiling statistics, or in fact doing their duty generally, and I believe their figures are as accurate as any Department of the Government or any private company's.

3286. By Mr. Barton—What margin do you think should be allowed in any estimate for construction in one direction, or of the traffic in the other?—Of course that can only be known by results, whether the margin they have laid down is right or wrong; but they have taken the average in comparison with the other suburbs, of which they have had experience in working, and I do not see that they could get any comparison better than that.

3287. You expressed the opinion that your officers are very intelligent and have given exact estimates. I want to know from you what you think is the margin they should come and go on?—I do not think I could answer a question of that kind.

3288. Provided it was 50 per cent., would they be good estimates?—No; I think that would be altogether out of the question.

3289. Would 25 per cent. be a good estimate?—I would not like to say. I say the figures on the basis on which they have arrived at them look reasonable figures on which to draw their conclusions.

3290. You form that opinion because you think they have given good estimates in the past; so you know their estimate as to the Outrim line?—That was an engineering matter. I am not dealing with the construction question just now, but the traffic. But as to the construction estimates, it has been pointed out before this Committee that the estimates of the Engineer-in-Chief have been found in many cases very reasonable, and that the work has been carried out within the estimate that has been given; the Outrim line may have been an exception. I really do not know what the cost of that was, but there may be reasons which the Engineer-in-Chief could adduce, which would be perfectly satisfactory to the Committee as to extra expenditure.

3291. How would we feel if we found on those lines that 25 per cent. had to be paid beyond the estimates after the construction?—I do not think you would be in any worse fix than before; but, in the meantime, you must be satisfied with the estimates given by my officers.

3292. By Mr. Harris.—As to Mr. Millane's scheme, you said that if it were adopted it would upset all your arrangements in some way?—Yes.

3293. Will you explain that?—[Copy of Mr. Millane's scheme printed and explained.].—It would simply upset the arrangements that the Department have been working up to; for years they have been carrying on their construction at Flinders-street; it averages their central station at Flinders-street; that arrangement; in place of our being able to bring those trains into Flinders-street—the common point for the convenient exchange of passengers—Mr. Millane's scheme takes them away to Spencer-street. That would not be a convenient arrangement for those lines; we want to bring the Heidelberg trains via the Collingwood line, and the Whittlesea trains via the Fitzroy line. Those trains will work the outer service beyond Flinders-street independently of the service of those two districts. His line does not give the service to those two districts, unless he runs this line parallel with the proposed line; and he leaves the important communication to the north without any communication whatever—pointing to the plan. His proposals are not at all suited to the proposed railway arrangements of bringing the traffic into Flinders-street.

3294. You have some of your own trains coming into Spencer-street, which run over the viaduct coming to Flinders-street?—Of course, the whole of the Essendon service runs through Spencer-street and over the viaduct into Flinders-street.

3295. So that it would not be any worse for Mr. Millane's trains?—It does not fit in with our proposed working through Flinders-street.

3296. But granting that it might not fit so well with your arrangements, Mr. Millane's scheme is to cost something like £214,000. The Collingwood and Fitzroy scheme combined cost something like £400,000 or £500,000; would it, in your opinion, be worth while constructing his scheme to save the enormous difference in these two amounts, although it might not be so convenient?—I do not think it would be at all worth considering the difference between the two estimates, although it is £200,000; we assume that it is £200,000—think if it is £20,000 a year at 4 per cent. I do not think it worth
considering for a single minute, because I believe that the arrangement we propose will save far more, both in interest and working expenses, than could be saved by the construction of a line by that route.

As regards that, I think it is rather unfair to ask me to express an opinion about a route I have never been over. I am only speaking now from a look at this map and the proposed line Mr. Millane suggests—I cannot speak of the districts of the city he is going to serve.

3298. Then before finally saying that Mr. Millane’s scheme would not be desirable, would it not be better to have some more serious and a lot be known later on?—No. I say, emphatically, it would not be in the interests of the Department to have that scheme coming into Spencer-street—it would not give us the service we want through the city of Melbourne. I am assured that the lines as laid down by the Department are much preferable to Mr. Millane’s.

3299. Would there be any strong objection to Mr. Millane’s scheme on the ground of the overhead bridges?—I am not sufficiently aware of what they have to do in his scheme—you have generally to go up and down steps at any station.

3300. By the Hon. E. Morley.—Have you made a calculation of what the cost would be to make a connection through from Prince’s-bridge to Flinders-street for all the northern lines?—I think they have only an estimate of the junction of those lines with the present line.

3301. By the Chairman.—Mr. Morley means that if the northern lines were connected and made to run through to Williamstown, would there be any extra expense in preparing those lines to make it a through traffic?—There would be no extra expense in the rearrangement of the station. The station wants enlarging now, and in rearranging that the lines of railway and platforms would be made to suit the through lines, but there is no expense that could be added against those lines, because the station will be common to all those lines.

3302. By the Hon. E. Morley.—But it would be a certain expense to make them complete to run right through; could you get what would be the cost of completing that?—The cost of re-building the station?

3303. Yes.—The station has nothing to do with the present lines. You must have accommodation, because the Williamstown trains do not run through now, and what we propose is to make them all through lines.

3304. So that when they are all connected we shall know what it will cost?—We are busy with a plan now, and we might be able to give it to you within a month, but it has nothing whatever to do with the building of those two lines.

3305. It is something to do with them if you intend to make your system complete all through?—No, we propose to build that station under any circumstances. It is too small for the traffic it stands. I take it that it would be only with a view of creating a precedent that you would debit any of the cost of the removal of that station to those lines because it has never been done in the past.

3306. A great deal of your coal trade goes across that viaduct?—Yes.

3307. Could not that be brought in by the Eastern Railway—No, if the lines were opened.

3308. Would it be at much greater cost bringing it that way?—Yes, it would mean the duplication of the present service from the point of junction where we would join and the opening of the lines that are at present closed.

3309. There is no doubt there will be a big coal trade?—It is to be hoped so, if the exports only hold out it will be a very big thing.

3310. By Mr. Buck. As to the estimate that was submitted to us; where did they provide for the construction of the foundations of the line?—At the point, at the junction of Prince’s-bridge.

3311. Then there would be some further expenditure to carry out your idea that we have not before us to connect with Flinders-street?—There has been an amount of money provided for re-building Flinders-street station on an enlarged scale.

3312. But there is no allowance on these estimates for anything beyond the point "A", junction—[showing on plan]—No.

3313. Then if the trains are to be taken right through to Flinders-street and Spencer-street, it will mean a great expenditure of money?—I think the money provided, independent of those lines, will be sufficient for that; it will be quite ample to take those lines.

3314. Do you mean the money for the central station?—Yes.

3315. Then that is in addition to the money for the construction of those lines?—No, the money is provided for the construction of Flinders-street station, and I say that money will be quite ample.

3316. By the Chairman.—I do not think the northern suburbs, if connected, should be hardened with more than they are entitled to. If the northern suburbs lines are not connected, and you require to re-arrange this Flinders-street station, I understand that it will cost just the same as if you make provision to connect those lines?—It will cost more, because provision will have to be made for a terminal station, whereas by bringing these lines in and making the terminal at those outer places instead of within the city it will save money.

3317. Then instead of the northern lines being debited with the money to bring them in to the station they ought to be credited?—That is so.

3318. By Mr. Buck. —Wait line there between Collingwood and Clifton Hill?—A single line.

3319. Do you intend it to be in this scheme?—No, I do not think it is in this scheme.

3320. On the Collingwood line it will be necessary to duplicate the line from Collingwood to Clifton Hill?—Yes, an estimate was sent to the Committee of £7,000 in addition to the first estimate. The plan was proposed by the Engineer-in-Chief, and they showed only a single line from Collingwood to Clifton Hill; but we believed it ought to be doubled, and this would be built as it were, by the Working Department, for the £7,000 at 1 per cent. £280 a year will have to be added to that estimate for the Collingwood line, because we felt we should be bound to double that line, though it was not shown.

3321. Therefore, it was right to state so?—Yes.

3322. By the Hon. D. McIvor. —Calling your attention to the estimates in the past, the estimate for this viaduct was £73,000, and it actually cost £139,000?—Excuse me, that is not the cost of the viaduct—that includes all the storage accommodation there in addition to the cost of the viaduct.
The discussion in Parliament show that we thought the matter and all would be constructed for the line. I think it is hardly fair to blame the officers of the Department who may have submitted an estimate for the line, and that after that was passed by the House of Commons, the Government of the day may have possibly thought (I do not know the facts) it desirable to incur a certain amount of additional expenditure in providing accommodation for certain other purposes altogether interminant to the construction of the line. I should like to make the Royal Park line applied for and the work done—then that was shifted half-a-mile out, and the whole of that worthless expenditure was debited to the Royal Park line, so that it cost £30,000 per mile going through that swamp, and the officers of the Railway Department should not be held responsible for that.

25. What guarantee have we that the present estimates will be within the mark, seeing our past history. The estimates in the past have been most unreliable; can we rely on it if you have given sufficient attention to see that these lines will not cost more than the estimates now before us? I explained when I was here the other day that the Engineer-in-Chief was responsible to the Minister—and is not now in any degree or form under the Commissioner, but it is matter of general knowledge that almost in every case the engineers' estimates are liable to be misunderstood, and therefore I consulted the Engineer-in-Chief (I could not do it officially) and I asked him specifically if he considered those works would be constructed for the amount of money put down.

26. We asked him the same question. I cannot go beyond the men's statement to me.

27. I asked him that question to the Committee line his estimate for that was £10,000. The Commissioner has nothing to do with the cost of a line, except saying to the Chief Engineer that certain accommodation must be provided at the stations.

28. Do you understand you to shun this responsibility, is not in my department at all—I cannot do anything, that the Engineer-in-Chief is to go to see that he has made ample provision.

29. What I want to know clearly is, do you build yourself responsible for having investigated these estimates, or do we, as a Committee, rely entirely on the Engineer-in-Chief? So far as the construction estimates are concerned you must take it that I have no responsibility.

30. As to the estimates again, we have now for the first time brought before us that this viaduct is to cost another £7,000. It is in your experience the ordinary custom of engineers that within four or five years of the completion of a viaduct that has cost so much money it is found that they have not foreseen something that would require a duplication. It appears to me that the arrangement had the foresight to see that it would be absolutely necessary to duplicate this viaduct in time, and, therefore, they made the provision to secure the land, and in the construction of the present viaduct provided that certain girders and piles should be made suitable for an additional viaduct to join on to it. In my own experience, before I left the old country, I was connected with a railway that carried about 60,000 of passengers into the city of Glasgow, and in this last season they have required power to duplicate the line for about 14 miles, with a view of maintaining the whole service. When in the course of a change of that line I forecast that it would be an absolute necessity to have it doubled; but do you think it was a possibility that the company at the time would have planked down £50,000 to duplicate that line when we could work the traffic without the necessity of doing so?

31. It is not three years since the viaduct was opened, and now can you say you have to spend another £75,000? I cannot be responsible for this report I have received, but no doubt the mistake was caused by the oversight that has largely increased. It was only in 1865 that they commenced to run those suburban trains over it. The traffic has grown probably faster than they anticipated, and it is not for the officers to say that this thing has to be replaced before that power that be provide the money. No doubt the officers would have built it before they had had the money.

32. At first sight it appears to me there is a great want of foresight if the thing is to be duplicated within three years of its being finished. I can only repeat what I have said, that the officers of the Department had the foresight to make the necessary provision for it whether they were relieved the necessary funds to complete the work. I cannot say, but they did what they could to save the country the additional expense that would be necessary when the time came for building an independent viaduct along the way they put the provision to ensure a suitable for future.

33. Suppose the northern traffic is brought in, within what time will you require this duplication?

34. We really want the duplication now, because it will be of use. We are working our trains every four minutes each way, and even though we were desirous of speeding up our services by duplicating, we could not run any more trains. I was in New York, and I believe the two lines are running through with different services, on the Spencer-street end of Filmore street station. We propose to utilise those trains in running a through service over these two lines, so that it is quite possible that the traffic, instead of being turned over at one, will turn the traffic and pass round the train they will remain at that station two or three minutes at most.

35. Could you not effect a connection temporarily of that small loop from Fairfield Park to Northcote by this outlay of £16,000? We could use it for goods' traffic, but it would be practically useless. I would not recommend spending a penny of that money for the accommodation of the passengers over those lines, and I can deal with the goods service without spending any money on that.

36. You think it would be no assistance?—It would be of assistance, because a train could run during without having to turn into C£fitton Hill and re-arranging, but it would cost £2000 for the signal staff, and I would save that by using the present Clifton Hill line.

37. I know that is not the case. I have not seen the contracts, but I think the officers of the Department are doing in a very sensible way in not spending any money on that.
3339. By Mr. J. S. White—There is a margin of 10 per cent. allowed now?—Yes.
3340. By Mr. Crease.—You said it was the intention to use Prinze's oil gas?—Yes.
3341. Do you intend to use that on all the country service as well?—We wish to fit up the long distance country trams first.
3342. What would be the cost of fitting the necessary appliances?—I can show you the figures, but I do not think they should be published. It will work at one-third less than the present cost for oil lamps, with a very much superior light.
3343. Would it be a very expensive matter to fit up for either of those proposed routes?—No.
3344. If that gas is used on those lines likely to be constructed there will be no extra cost in making apparatus to make the gas on their account?—None whatever.
3345. As to the passenger train mileage within the suburban radius, I have it in the Railway Inquiry Board's Report?—I will be very glad to supply it.
3346. Will you give the mileage within 10 miles?—I will and that.
3347. By Mr. J. S. White.—Will you give the earnings on each line separately per train mile?—I will endeavor to do so.
3348. By Mr. Becton.—As to the estimates, I have here the First General Report of the Railways Standing Committee. On page 35 it shows the estimated cost of certain lines and the actual cost. I will mention two lines connected with the two lines we are considering. The Royal Park to Clifton Hill line was estimated to cost £37,785, but it cost £41,732. The next was the Fitzroy line: it was estimated to cost £11,876, and the actual cost was £7,961. The question I want to put to you is, is there any possibility of such a serious error creeping into the estimate before we saw it?—I do not think so.
3349. Would you like to take your reputation on that?—I will stake my reputation on the result of those lines. I said the other day, it is quite possible to build a line that will never show results; the expenditure would be so great that it would never be justified. That Royal Park line, at a cost of £60,000 per mile through a swamp, is one.
3350. The Chairman.—For the exchange line running into Fitzroy, along on the Heidelberg-road, the estimate for the land was £11,000, and its actual cost was £20,000.

The witness withdraw.

Adjusted to tomorrow, at four o'clock.
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3351. By the Chairman.—After hearing a great deal of evidence we have called you again, with the view of ascertaining whether you still adhere to your original estimate with reference to those northern suburbs lines. In your original estimate you did not make any provision for the duplication of the line from Clifton Hill to Collingwood?—No.
3352. Since then you have made an estimate?—No, that was made by the Commissioner. That is an existing line, and nothing requiring to be done to an existing line came under the Commissioner. If he thinks a line should be duplicated to meet new traffic, he provides for it, and asks for the money to do it—it is not part of the cost of the line from Prahran-bridge to Collingwood station.
3353. They say then it would cost £7,883?—Yes.
3354. You think that is a fair estimate?—I have no doubt of it. If they have rendered that I have confidence that they would estimate the thing accurately.
3355. Who is the engineer for that?—Mr. Newman, the Engineer for Existing Lines. The Commissioner would ask him for an estimate for that.
3356. Have you any objection to make as to the loop line, the one from Preston North to Clifton Hill, or the one from South Preston or beyond that to North Fitzroy or to the Preston line?—No, those estimates stand.
3357. Did you give an estimate as to the loop line from the present Outer Circle, west of Merri Creek, to the Fitzroy coo-pper?—Which line is that?
3358. You know the line from Preston?—Yes.
3359. That goes by North Fitzroy station?—No, that is part of the new scheme.
3360. That would necessitate a loop to connect with the present coo-pper line Fitzroy station?—Yes; the Fitzroy line, so called, is a line from Prince's-bridge to Northcote, including that loop.
3361. Then you do not interfere in your estimate with the existing coo-pper?—No, excepting that the new line to Fitzroy, being a high-level line, will necessitate the reconstruction of the Fitzroy station, which I have provided for in my estimate.
3362. You were to give evidence a few months ago—you have had an opportunity of seeing what other people have said—have you any reason to alter your estimate as far as it has been submitted to us?—I have seen only the newspaper reports of the evidence, and from those I have no reason to alter my views in any respect.
3363. You will adhere to your opinion that those two lines would pay?—Yes, decidedly, although, of course, that does not come under me. I gave an estimate of the cost to the Minister. I think both of them are very promising lines from a paying point of view.
3363. Supposing you were employed by a private company—take the case of the Hobson's Bay Company, were you not more confident an engineer, would you take on yourself to recommend them to employ the railway in question? If they were satisfied with a result of 2 or 3 per cent. if they capital I should certainly recommend both lines. It they expected to make, at the current railway charges, 7 or 8 per cent. on their capital I would say do not waste money.

3364. The Government of Victoria are not getting 7 or 8 per cent. on their lines?—No; that is the reason I say the lines are justifiable on a basis of 3 per cent., or 3 per cent. on the capital.

3365. By the Hon. J. J. Medley.—In what respect does the present proposed Fitzroy line differ from the Fitzroy line of 1891? does it differ in any particular?—No.

3366. What is your present estimate: how much have you made it less than your cost of construction in 1890-91?—The 1891 estimate was £316,789 for the Fitzroy line; the present estimate is £230,317. The present estimate is 75 per cent. of the 1891 estimate; that is, material, labour, and property have declined 27 per cent.

3367. Do you think labour has declined?—Yes.

3368. In what particular? say the bricklayers, has their pay fallen?—Yes, very materially, because in those days methods were getting 1s. or 1s. 6d. a day; now the minimum wage is 8s.

3369. What about the foremen?—In the same proportion.

3370. Then there is a dear difference in materials; we can rely on that?—Yes, that is my opinion.

3371. By Mr. Green.—What is the drop in the wages of the labourers?—Men were getting 8s. an hour, 8s. a day, in those days; now they get 6s.

3372. By the Hon. J. J. Medley.—Does that apply to the Collinsville line also?—Yes. The present estimate is about 75 per cent. of the 1891 estimate.

3373. By the Hon. E. More.—What is the date of the interest in the railways?—About 75 per cent.

3374. Then the railways would pay if they returned that?—Yes, they would pay their ways.

3375. You are not in favour of this line to Collingwood going through the Melbourne Cricket Ground?—No.

3376. Do not you think, considering there is so much traffic there, it would help to make this line pay?—I do not think you would gain sensibly if you put a station near the cricket ground over what you would get with a station in Wellington-Parade—practically that will serve the people who go to the cricket ground.

3377. As Engineer-in-Chief you know the lines to the south-east as well as the others, Brighton, Frankston, and so on, do you think there ought to be a platform at the cricket ground on the present existing lines? I think it is a matter worth consideration, but the Commissioner would be in a much better position to give an opinion on that point than I should. It has often presented itself to me that it would be advisable to have a stopping place by the Melbourne Cricket Ground on the existing lines.

3378. It seems strange that those people should have to come in from all those districts and go out again when they could stop on the road?—I think so.

3379. Why should not the people coming from St. Kilda and Williamstown on the western side go east on the present lines, and be dropped there?—I think the question deserves very careful consideration.

3380. The Commissioner gave an estimate of about £90,000 to do that; surely that ought to be worth consideration?—I should think so; but, as I say, he should be in a much better position to give a judgment on that point than myself. I have often thought it would be desirable to have a station at the cricket ground.

3381. By the Hon. J. J. Medley.—Again, as to your estimates, it appears you are held to be exclusively responsible for those estimates of construction?—Yes.

3382. Now is your new attractive railway to the latest, the Outtrim line?—I explained that to the Committee on no less than one occasion, and if they want more information on it, the Minister of Railways has a memorandum of mine that explains the whole thing.

3383. Up to now the whole of our history has been unfortunate.—I suppose you will admit that?—Certainly I do not.

3384. Soing, they will have doubled the cost in almost every line?—I will take your own instance according to the newspaper report you referred to, the Colling line—the estimate for that line was for a single line, and it was constructed as a single line. The line has been duplicated, and very large accommodation works have been provided since, and I suppose you compare the estimate for the original single line with the actual cost at the present line as a double one with all the accommodation on it now—two very different things.

3385. What I believe is that we have been most unfortunate in every line, and the estimate both in land and in construction has been enormously exceeded?—All the estimates made by the late Mr. Higham were far, and very few of them were exceeded. After his time the estimates in many cases were largely exceeded. Under the Act 821, or the "Octopus" Act, which provided for the construction of 1,200 miles of railway which were laid out during the boom period, the cost exceeded the estimate by nearly 50 per cent. The whole lines have all been constructed under the estimates.

3386. Who estimated the cost of the violin?—I could not tell you, but it was done under Mr. Watson, the then Engineer-in-Chief. Referring to that, the money provided under Act 821 was £75,000, but the location of the line was completely changed, and the line has been constructed, not on the design of that estimate at all, but on a new and different design involving a much larger expenditure.

3387. What is the object of that account at present?—I do not know within £5,000, but I have been told that the violin railway, starting at Spencer-street from the archway and going into Flinders-street-yard (not including the viaduct, because those are buildings), cost £100,000.

3388. Is that up to date?—Yes.

3389. What do you add for rails?—It is a separate vote for that?—Certainly. I know that they are the most comparatively railway work that has been carried out lately. The original location of the railway was on the site of the Sir Charles Hudson Hotel, a property which would have to be purchased, and nothing was allowed in the estimate for that. The line has been deviated towards the Yarra, and made much longer than was intended under the first design, and if it had been carried out under the original design the present Railway officers could not have been erected at all where they are.
3390. At the time you designed those, did you view the duplication of the viaduct?—Yes. The viaduct has been designed with a view of future duplication—it was always intended to do that. It was held it would be necessary almost immediately, or very soon, to duplicate the viaduct, not for the construction of those northern lines, but for general railway purposes.

3391. Suppose I were to demand this now?—Yes, I can be expressly told that the opinion that it should be done at once.

3392. Will you provide another £7,000?—Yes, more than that, I should think.

3393. £100,000?—I think not, because some of the work is already done.

3394. Then properly that estimate originally should have been £200,000 instead of £73,000?—If it was an estimate of the future viaduct railway that would be required when the traffic grew, it should be four times instead of two, but it was made for a double line to meet the then necessities of the traffic.

3395. It was constructed about three years ago?—Yes.

3396. Was it sufficient when it was first opened?—Yes, and is now.

3397. Is the traffic greater than it was?—Yes, because they are running more through trains.

3398. How do you account for that seeing the falling off in the railway traffic this year?—That is only in the aggregate, but in the traffic over the viaduct the number of trains has increased; that is a matter of railway policy.

3399. Then in the course of three years, in fact, from the moment it was opened, the viaduct was practically insufficient?—I do not think so.

3400. What was it designed to carry?—An altogether depends on how the traffic is worked. You can run trains each way over that viaduct at intervals of 2½ minutes if you have block stations made to suit.

3401. Do you run any risk now in not having this duplication?—I cannot answer that. As far as I know, the viaduct has been quite sufficient up to the present time. If Mr. Mathieson says it is not sufficient to meet the traffic he intends to run over that section, of course that is his judgment and altogether another matter.

3402. The question was put to him:—Is it in your experience the ordinary custom of engineers that four or five years of the completion of a viaduct that has cost so much money it is found that they had not foresight enough to see that it would require duplication? You say the foresight was there?—I say it was always contemplated that railway would require duplication, and it is altogether a question of management whether and at what time and under what circumstances it is to be applied. One may run more trains to Finsbury-court than another would, it is altogether a question of conducting the traffic.

3403. Is the traffic now, according to Mr. Mathieson, the duplication must be gone on with?—Yes.

3404. Then it is not required specially because of those northern suburbs?—No, I do not look on it as bringing to the northern suburbs any more than to any other of the suburban lines.

3405. Then what will be the limit, to be well within it, for the duplication of the viaduct?—You will have to ask the Commissioners as to that; his estimates will make an estimate according to the accommodation required; I should say £5,000 would duplicate the viaduct.

3406. We have to raise the amount of money that this railway to the northern suburbs is to cost?—For all future times.

3407. No, for the present—we have to raise the amount of money?—Not only what the lines themselves will cost, but what other lines imaging in some measure on them will also cost.

3408. Yes?—Then to get a definite answer about the viaduct you will have to ask Mr. Mathieson.

3409. He says the viaduct is wanted, irrespective of the northern suburbs?—Then his opinion should have weight.

3410. Then there will be no alteration in your estimate—no deck discoveries is the tunnel?—As to the future and the contingencies that may arise in carrying out these works I would not commit myself, because I should be attempting to prophesy, and I do not intend to do that; but to the best of my judgment those lines can be carried out at the figures I have given the Committee on the present basis of the labour and material market in the colony.

3411. You mean to carry it out on the batty-gang system?—Yes.

3412. Would it cheapen the cost if both those men were let in large contracts?—I should add 12½ per cent, to my estimate of the works that would be included in those contracts if each line were to be let, as the old custom was, in one contract.

3413. By Mr. Jameson.—As to the viaduct, is it not a fact that in its construction the contemplation of duplicating it was kept in view?—Yes.

3414. Was not some of the work in it done that would not have been done if it were not to be duplicated?—Yes, on the bridges you can see the places left, the need of the brickwork, and also places for the girders.

3415. If the viaduct had been made to carry only the lines now working on it would it not have been more cheaply made?—Yes, a little.

3416. By Mr. J. S. White.—You think four lines are of very sufficient for the traffic here over that when the northern suburbs come in?—I think it would be difficult to provide for more than four, because you would obstruct the wharfs and the streets so much.

3417. There is a bottleneck at Richmond, why should not one be left here?—I do not call it a bottleneck. I think those four lines will serve all the traffic for the next 40 or 50 years under a proper block system of working the trains.

3418. You have not supplied us with the quantities in each contract; that is a schedule showing the number of yards in each tunnel?—I can supply the Committee with the detailed estimates of each line.

3419. Will you do so? We have to carry earthworks, brickwork, ironwork, concrete, and everything required. Perhaps I can supply the Committee now with a few figures that may satisfy you. Those estimates are based on such figures as these—bricks at 36s. a thousand at the kiln landed into railway trucks; the cement not exceeding 1s. a sack; gravel 2½ to 3½s., 4s. a cubic yard; asphalt 8s. per ton; quarry faced, solid set on the pie, at 4s. a cubic foot; steel and iron at the present English prices.
4240. What is that?—They vary according to the quality and kind of material. Steel bars and steel plates are from £5 10s. to £7 a ton in the English market.

4241. Have you calculated and can you give the price at per cubic yard set, including labour and everything?—Yes, I have quoted the prices for some of the materials and also the prices for labour that the estimates are based on, the minimum rate that is allowed to large railway contracts. I will quote those to you so that there shall be no misunderstanding. Copper, 8s.; gunnys, 6s. 6d. bricklayer, 7s. 6d. plasterer, 8s.; blacksmith, 10s.; engine-driver, 8s.; labourers, 8s. 6d.; we would pick these: platers, hewers, slaters, 8s. 6d.; joiners, 10s. 6d.; iron turners, 10s.; potters, 11s.; copper-workers, 10s.; bricklayers for engineering lines work, 10s.

Now as to the prices for work that I have carried out the estimates are, and of which the bulk of the work would be constituted. I will quote the prices:—Cement concrete in bridges, 25s. per cubic yard; gravel in concrete, 25s. per cubic yard; brickwork in masonry, 2s. 6d. per cubic yard; solid steel in girders, 25s. per ton; mild steel in trough flooring, 35s. a ton; mild steel in culverts, 35s. a ton. Now the Fitzroy tunnel is estimated at 10s. a cubic yard for excavation; the cement concrete in the lining, 45s. per cubic yard; brick in concrete in arch, 45s. per cubic yard. For the east and west tunnel on the Collingwood line the excavation in the open is given at 25s. a cubic yard; our willing to be done, 8s. a cubic yard extra; cement concrete in earth, 35s. per cubic yard; brick in cement earth, 35s. The estimates are at 9d. to 2s. 6d. a cubic yard; the removal of surplus material for extra earth, 1s. 6d. a cubic yard. Machine, import, cope, and string course, quarry-dried work, 5s. 6d. to 10s. a cubic yard. These are the bases of the total estimate for the work. As regards the quantities of material that we will require if one or half of those lines are carried out, we should require about 610 tons of steel for the Collingwood line and 219 tons for the Fitzroy line. We would require little over 1,000,000 bricks for earth lines; 11,000 for the tunnel, practically the same for each.

4242. By the Chairman.—Do you know whether you were asked your opinion as to a double tunnel instead of one?—Two tunnels would cost more than one. Two tunnels for two single lines would cost more than one for a double line.

4243. By Mr. J. S. White.—There would not be as much material;—There would be more material and labour in two small tunnels than in one large one. That is my opinion; I have not gone into details of that.

4244. We had evidence from other engineers, and asked had they calculated what the line should cost, and they said they could not tell till they knew the quantity of material going in?—I will supply the Committee with detailed estimates if they wish.

4245. By the Hon. D. M'Kellar.—If these lines are let and carried on contemporaneously would you then require more money or less?—I do not think I should require more; I should not require less; it might delay each line a little.

4246. By Mr. J. S. White.—As to this evidence about a tunnel and a lot of unnecessary things, have you added any percentage for those?—Ten per cent., that is the total.

4247. No larger than that for the unforeseen work?—No.

4248. But it may cost more?—Of course it may, if the labour market changes, if there is another boom.

4249. But the kind of material you have to go through?—Certainly; those are the consequences.

4250. By the Hon. D. M'Kellar.—Do you know the rock formation?—We know pretty well the rocks all round Melbourne; we know the geological formation. There have been excavations made.

4251. By Mr. J. S. White.—You have not tested the ground thoroughly?—We have not tried trial shafts or bored, but in carrying out ordinary building operations the shafts have been explored over and over again, and we are pretty well acquainted with the nature of the country and the different rocks and charges.

4252. By Mr. McCauley.—What class of rock is it?—Sandstone in the Eastern Hill.

4253. By Mr. J. S. White.—You have heard of a line starting from the South Sands Hotel and bringing the Brunswick traffic into Melbourne by way of Fitzroy; have you considered that?—I applied the Commissioner with an estimate of the cost of making that line; beyond that, I have not considered it.

4254. You have not considered whether it would be the right thing to do?—I think it would be a wrong thing to do. The Fitzroy and Collingwood lines will have quite sufficient traffic of their own without running the Colling and Brunswick traffic that way. I see disadvantages as well, because you would rob the present North Melbourne or the Royal Park line of the traffic and would increase the working expenses of the line proportionately; you would increase the rate.

4255. Were you Assistant Engineer-in-Chief when that line was made from Royal Park to Clifton Hill line?—No; I was Assistant Engineer for Existing Lines.

4256. Could you supply us with the number of owners and the amount of money paid for the land on the line from the Royal Park to Clifton Hill?—The Fitzroy occasion?—That could be supplied.

4257. That one cost £90,000 odd for land, and the Collingwood was £92,000, and I would like to know how many owners, the names of the owners, and the quantity of land taken from each?—If your secretary will write to the Commissioner for Railways asking for the information it will be supplied. As to the estimate of the property included in my estimate of the cost of these lines, that has been based on the municipal rates for 1884, with a liberal percentage for compulsory taking.

4258. What do you sell fields?—25s. per cent. Twenty per cent. Properties there have not been selling lately, and where they have had to change hands, people have had to part with their properties at nothing like the rating value.

4259. In making that valuation have you just valued the exact land you are going to take?—We have made a valuation of the land to be taken and the damages done to adjoining properties, just sufficient to construct the line.

4260. Mr. Mackie has said he expected a large revenue from surplus land?—When we take a portion of an allotment, or cut a house in two, we propose to purchase the whole property, because we should pay just what we would pay for the whole property. That is based on for the whole property, and when the lines are finished there will be some buildings, and perhaps some surplus land that can either be let or sold. That will add to the revenue, but I would not count on it to any great extent; that is something up our sleeves, so to speak.
3441. By Mr. Craven.—Do you think the mere fact of property having gone a little up lately in price, and the fact of a line being carried to Collingwood or Fitzroy, will not at once cause a considerable increase in the value of property and what people will ask for compensation?—It would certainly have the effect that I have any, but then, under the law, I think we are entitled to purchase the properties as the value at the time the railway was authorized. The value is arrived at in various ways, and no doubt sometimes evidence is made and values go up.

3442. Will the people have an opportunity of going to arbitration?—Yes.

3443. Will the Government be “stopped,” as usual?—It may be.

3444. By Mr. Harris.—Has that been your experience, that they have been “stopped”?—I think the State has always paid a little more than fair value for land and properties for railways.

3445. And whenever they have gone to arbitration they have got the worst of it?—Or the law, either. A big corporation generally gets let in.

3446. By Mr. Craven.—As to the mode of construction of these two lines, have you any designs run out showing the mode of construction?—The detailed drawings are not all prepared, because the work was stopped at a certain stage by the Minister of Railways, but we have a good many drawings prepared, and I have brought them up.

3447. What have you got in a pattern of what is to be carried out?—Yes.

3448. It is sufficiently minute, I presume, to allow us to make a pretty fair estimate of the actual quantities required?—Yes; and there are working drawings.

3449. Some time ago the Committee asked you to prepare some sections near the cricket ground of two new roads. One of them, the one from Richmond, going to the Richmond side of the cricket ground, shows a considerable length of tunnel—one good deal less than either of the present proposed routes by the Department. Is it not the case that the one south of the Melbourne Cricket Ground shows a considerable amount of tunnel, and the roof of such tunnel would be only 5 or 6 feet thick?—Yes, that would be cut and covered.

3450. Do you know whether that is a part of it where it would be necessary to cover it?—Yes, because it crosses the Post-road and a right-of-way and on under Bridge-road.

3451. Are there not places in between that could be kept open?—They would not be worth leaving.

3452. Not as a means of ventilation?—We would provide for that.

3453. You do not think it would materially affect the cost if those portions were left open?—No, it would not; that was considered in the design.

3454. In view of last Saturday's pre-seedlings at the cricket ground, would any station, short of one right on the ground, be of any use to the people?—I think so. If people wanted to go from Heidelberg to the cricket ground they would get out at Wellington-paraule.

3455. On Saturday they insisted on going into the ground with the cats?—When a man engages a cat that is quite natural.

3456. Assuming it were necessary to provide for the traffic to the cricket ground, if a platform were constructed at or on the very boundary of the ground, would that be so inventive to the people to travel by the railway rather than by the tram?—I should think so. That is why I say it seems to me that a station on the existing lines, near the cricket ground, would be a desirable thing; but it is all a question of £ s. d.

3457. By the Hon. D. Melville.—What amount of money is still available for railway construction?—I have seen it repeatedly stated in reports by the Treasurer and printed documents, that there is £800,000 or 2,000,000.

3458. After you have deducted the cost of the new grading work?—Yes.

3459. Who is the custodian of that?—You will see it in the last Railway Report, and any further information would be obtainable from the Secretary of Railways.

3460. By the time you have duplicated the viaduct and built these two lines we will have finished that money?—If you spend it all on that.

3461. There is also the grading?—I have not to do with that.

3462. Do I understand that we do not require to borrow money—that we have still enough left?—I do not know what money there may be in the Treasury, but there is sufficient loan money available.

3463. For both works—the viaduct and these two lines?—Yes.

3464. By Mr. Harris.—You said in reply to Mr. Money that it struck you as a desirable thing to have a station at the cricket ground; did you read Mr. Mathieson's reply to Mr. Money as to that matter?—I read his reply, but I have not seen his evidence. The Treasurer said—"We have some doubt as to the expense of a station for the cricket ground;" and in reply Mr. Mathieson said—"I have gone into that matter, and I find that the cost of giving platforms there would be £5,000, and that the traffic would not pay us to have the accommodation there. There would be an annual loss of probably £1,200 a year, even estimating that we carried 100,000 people. We assume that all we would get for the fare there would be a mere fraction over the present fare, and therefore the amount of money we would derive would not pay interest and working expenses." In the opinion I gave to the Committee about a station there I said—"Of course Mr. Mathieson's opinion on that should be much more valuable than mine.

3465. You have not gone into those matters closely yourself?—No. I think the public accommodation is the first consideration, and, apart altogether from its paying or not paying, I am sure it would be a great public accommodation to have a station near the cricket ground, and it ought, it seems to us, to procure traffic.

3466. If it were shown to you that a great loss would result, even allowing fair consideration for additional traffic, would you still say the accommodation should be provided?—No. I should have to carefully study that question, the pros and cons, before I gave an opinion.

3467. By Mr. Tremethick.—Talking of viaducts, is there any way of utilising the Outer Circle railway to take the Crippsland goods traffic, thus relieving the viaduct?—Certainly; and I believe that one of the principal reasons urged for the construction of the Outer Circle line was to take the Crippsland cattle and goods traffic round to Spencer-street.
3468. As a matter of fact it is lying idle now — Yes, and at any time when the management see the propriety of doing so it can be set going.

3469. By the Chairman — Do you know Mr. John McGregor, a civil engineer and contractor? — I do not. I have seen his name in the newspaper as giving evidence as to an electric tunnel railway.

3470. He gave his opinion that two tunnels would be much cheaper than one tunnel — It depends altogether on the depth below the surface, and where the tunnels would be put, and what they would be for. If you had to employ cut-and-cover segments or pipes to make your tunnels and at a great depth below the surface two single tunnels might be cheaper than one large tunnel, but that is not the condition on these proposed lines at all.

3471. He was speaking of those particular lines; he knew the country, and he proposed a scheme to us which he is willing to carry out. If advertised for he will tender for it, and if it is given to him he will guarantee to carry it out under Government supervision. He was asked — Why not save a single tunnel for both lines? — He said — It is more expensive and difficult to construct. You want more head-room for it; two single tunnels are cheaper than one to carry a double line, and it is better for ventilation. — He was asked then — If you were given this contract, and you were given the choice whether you would have single tunnels or a double tunnel, you would prefer the single tunnels? — His answer was — Of course, I could not say the exact difference in cost, but it is a well-known fact that the large double tunnel is more expensive. You have to make it about 25 feet in diameter. — He then read from some of the first engineers in support of his views — Did he carry out the double tunnels himself? I know that in the City and South London railway a new line lately opened there, an electrical railway, they have carried out two tunnels instead of one large one. Mr. Greathead did that, but those are tunnels going very deep down under the Thames, and no doubt it is much cheaper to run a single-line tunnel under a river than a double-line tunnel, but the conditions are totally different on the Collingwood and Fitzroy lines.

3472. By Mr. Harris — You said that in the boom time when the "octopus" lines were constructed when 5,000 miles of railway were authorized, they cost 20 per cent. more than the estimate? — Yes.

3473. Why did they? — Because the estimate was made when labour and materials were very cheap and the works were carried out when labour and materials and property were very dear.

3474. Those were the only reasons? — Those were the chief reasons. Another reason was that larger and greater works, providing more accommodations, were constructed on those lines than was intended in the original estimates.

3475. Was that the fault of the original estimate, or was it because a demand was made for more than the original estimate was based on? — It was a difference of policy; I could not say whether it was justified or not, at least, I am not going to say, but it was under a different railway policy.

3476. It did not arise through any short-sightedness in framing the original estimates? — You could call it that in a sense, they did not know their successors would come on the scene with larger views. The conditions when the estimates were made and the conditions when the works were carried out were totally different.

3477. When the viaduct is duplicated will it do for the northern suburbs lines and the traffic there is now? — It depends altogether on how they wish to work the traffic. If the northern suburban trains are to go through to Spencer-street or run from Heidelberg to Williamstown or Essendon and vice versa, then the viaduct would be required and you would require sufficient accommodation for that, but if the traffic were to stop at either Prince's-bridge or Flinders-street, the viaduct would not be required for those two lines at all.

3478. Do you know what area is available in Flinders-street for adding to the viaduct? — The land available to the Railway Department for viaduct purposes is only sufficient for four lines. It was settled with the City Corporation at the time the viaduct was built.

3479. You say the calculation of the cost of the land is based on the municipal valuation for 1894? — Yes.

3480. Is the value for 1895 the same as for 1894? — It is a little less.

3481. Then the probabilities are that the land would not lose — If we would get the land at its present value, at what anybody would purchase the land for as an investment, we would get it at a great deal less than my estimate. The estimate for the properties was made by an officer of mine whom I can depend on.

3482. Are you willing to give your opinion as to what line should be constructed first? — Yes; as I said before, I think of the two the Collingwood is the one that should be constructed first.

3483. Because it would yield the greatest revenue? — I think it is needed more, because they have not the railway facilities that the Fitzroy people have, and also because, according to Mr. Matheson's estimate, it would pay better than the other.

3484. Then if only one line was to be constructed, would you recommend Collingwood or Fitzroy? — I would recommend Collingwood first, and Fitzroy to follow.

3485. You believe both to be necessary? — Yes, that both are desirable, and that they will pay fairly well.

3486. How do you propose to bring the Collingwood and Fitzroy traffic into Spencer-street? — That is the Commissioner's matter — that is a question of amalgamating the railways and conducting the traffic.

3487. You are satisfied that four lines of way will be enough from Flinders-street to Spencer-street, including the Collingwood and Fitzroy traffic? — Yes, I think that four lines of way should be enough for the traffic for many a year.

3488. If it be so, why was Richmond increased to six double lines of way with a smaller traffic? — In the first place it was not increased to six double lines; there are only three double lines.

3489. By Mr. J. S. White — There are six lines of way? — Yes, six single lines, and the whole of the eastern and southern traffic lines to come through Richmond, and it is simply a matter of conducting the traffic — a question of what traffic will go over the viaduct. If the manager came on the scene, and said every train that ran between either Flinders-street, Prince's-bridge, or Spencer-street must go over the viaduct, four lines of way would not be sufficient.
3490. Is not the block system a dangerous one? — No, it is the essence of safety.

3491. Why was it objected to at Richmond? — It is carried out strictly at Richmond. Of course under the most advanced system of conducting railway traffic two lines of railway at Richmond were not insuficient, hence other lines were provided.

3492. By the Chairman. — Because they were going into three different localities? — Yes, and because of the frequency in the number of trains.

3493. Mr. McGregol states that in London last year they carried over a double line 7,000,000 passengers — That is on the City and South London railway; I think our suburban traffic comes to something like 40,000,000 passengers in the year, the present suburban lines.

3494. At the request of Mr. Milban we send a letter to you asking you to give him some assistance in looking over his scheme. — Yes, I am preparing an estimate according to my views of the cost of his scheme. Mr. Milban gave me sections, and he marked his route on a plan in the office, and I am preparing an estimate now of what railways constructed after the model of the estimates I have rendered to the Committee would cost along his route.

3495. By Mr. Carnes. — Would the general design of the overhead work be the same as your work? — Yes.

3496. By Mr. Harris. — Can you say whether Mr. Milban’s figures are about reasonable? — No, I will not venture on that.

3497. By Mr. Treswith. — Have you any detailed sections of his plan? — Only the longitudinal section of the track, upon which he proposes to construct his railway. He supplied us with no drawings except the section, and marked the route on a plan in my office.

3498. You are practically designing a railway over that route? — Yes, to compare with the cost of the railway I have designed over the other routes.

3499. By Mr. J. S. White. — You say it is not your intention to construct the northern suburban lines to come into Fliinders-street, but into Prince’s bridge? — Yes, our survey is from Prince’s bridge station-yard to Northcote on the one side and Collingwood on the other.

3500. Will there be any extra cost to bring the traffic into Fliinders-street? — It depends on where they intend to handle the trains, and that is a matter for the Commissioneer. That would be included in his estimate of the re-arrangement of the Fliinders-street and Prince’s bridge stations.

3501. Your estimate is for bringing both lines into Prince’s bridge? — Yes.

3502. Evidence has been given to us as to the advisability of closing Prince’s bridge station — you did not consider that? — No, that is not part of my work.

3503. By Mr. Harris. — Is it any use at present to ask you any questions as to Mr. Milban’s scheme, are you prepared to give your answers? — No, but when I send my reply to the Committee I will give my views along with my estimate.

3504. By Mr. Carnes. — When will that be ready? — I will endeavour to supply it to-morrow.

3505. By the Hon. D. McIvor. — As to working the suburban railways, are we to adhere to the present method with those tunnels, or do you contemplate ever working the suburban system by electricity? — That is looking ahead. Some people think electricity will be the motive power on railways of all kinds.

3506. By Mr. Treswith. — Supposing it were, it would require no alteration in the works you are carrying out? — No; it would require some additions. As to lighting, the simplest and best way would be with the electric light in the tunnels to have them permanently lighted.

3507. By the Hon. D. McIvor. — Have you anything to indicate the relative cost of electricity for the suburban system as against steam? — The late Railways Commissioners considered a project for conducting the St. Kilda and Port Melbourne traffic by electricity; you could get some information from that.

3508. One of the great drawbacks on our railways is that with steam — on the Collingwood line, for instance, you can give only one train between seven and eight; if you could by electricity give two or three trains, how would you double your incomes? — That is a matter for considerations.

3509. If you give trains on the Pinney line only once in half-an-hour will you lose your traffic? — One of the great advantages of electric traction, the same as with cable, is that you can multiply your trains, and also give for short or distant trains and cables and railways to go, as in my opinion, on the whole preferable; but for lengthy journeys or remote distant suburban traffic, where you need to have very long trains to accommodate the passengers in the morning and evening at the busy times of the day, and where you have only sufficient tracks to accommodate the trains, to run them at two or five minutes interval, electric traction would be no advantage there, because you cannot run a sufficient number of short trains to accommodate the traffic as you can with a steam locomotive. But when they bring electricity to such perfection that they can run 20 or 30 vehicles in a train then it will be worth consideration for our remote suburban traffic.

3510. There is nothing the Department has advanced that shows us that is approaching? — I have not considered the latest phase of the electric question, but the late Commissioners have, and you might get valuable opinions from them. Mr. Woodruffe could give you that. Before I leave I would like to submit a few questions about the probability of these proposed lines being paying lines. I gave you some statistics of the south suburban traffic in my previous evidence. The Commissioners published up to 1883 a detailed statement of the revenue from all the different systems, and to that year you will find in every year the south suburban line is constantly considered and given. The cost of the "south suburban railway," that is the 16½ miles that figure in our books under that name, including rolling stock to the present time would be about £2,250,000, that is with all the additional equipment and construction since taking over the Hoban's Res line.

3511. By Mr. J. S. White. — Does that include the line to Caulfield? — No, only the lines to Port Melbourne, St. Kilda, Hawthorn, and Brighton, including the two stations — Prince’s bridge and Flinders-street. In 1889 the passengers were 57,162,247, and the revenue as stated in our books £402,341. The net revenue of that is, after working expenses were deducted, was £174,290. In the year 1893 these lines returned 7½ per cent. on a capital of two millions and a quarter. In 1891 the passengers were 55,455,383, and the revenue £79,100. The net revenue was £146,492, and the percentage on the capital 6½ per cent. In 1892 the passengers were 54,396,935, and the revenue £531,057. The net revenue was
£129,920, returning 2½ per cent on the capital. In 1853, the last year in which the figures have been separated in our returns, the passengers were 25,312,996; revenue, £300,866; and the net revenue, £105,553, a return on the capital of 47½ per cent. A comparison of those figures will show what a decline there has been in the suburban traffic over these railways—4½ per cent. In 1893, as against 7½ per cent. in 1890.

3512. By the Hon. D. McElvain.—How much have you increased the capital account between those points?—Very little.

3513. How much have you increased the working expenses?—I have given you the gross and the net revenue, and you can get it from that.

3514. You have carried the same number of passengers?—No, there has been a great decrease.

3515. If there has been a decrease in the passengers has there been a decrease in the fares?—No, the fares were increased in 1892, and then decreased to the old rates subsequently. It is the reduction in the volume of traffic that has produced the diminution of the revenue.

3516. By Mr. J. S. White.—Have the trains anything to do with that?—Undoubtedly, the trains have some effect.

3517. By the Hon. D. McElvain.—But as far as that goes, the lines are still remunerative?—Yes; even in 1893 it returned 4½ per cent.

3518. And you have arrived at the conclusion that the complete suburban system, taking bad and good, pays its way; is that passengers only?—No, the whole revenue earned by those railways, the suburban railways.

3519. Can you complete it up to date?—Up to and including 1893.

3520. Taking the return published to the Railway Inquiry Board, it shows that with passengers only there was a loss of £25,000 a year, but taken with the goods and parcels it would show an enormous profit?—The whole of the traffic should of course be credited to any railway.

3521. You admire those figures to show that you have nothing to fear by the addition to the traffic of the Fitzroy and Collingwood lines?—Yes. As I said before, for the 5 miles of the Collingwood and Fitzroy railways you have a population of 80,000—10,000 a mile. You have as much as that on the main suburban railways; for the 15 miles I have quoted you have about 12,000 a mile.

3522. By Mr. Cohen.—If you asked the Coburg line to the west it would not reduce your estimate?—It might. There is another phase of those lines compared with the tramways. The railways will give a quicker service than the tramways, but besides that they will have the additional advantage, that the fares will be very much cheaper. If you pay 2/- for a tramway ticket twice a day, that is 5d., and for 300 days in a year your expenditure will be £8 5s. Now on some of the stations on the suburban lines you can travel first class for £3 10s. 6d., and second class, £2 10s. There is a great difference there, especially to a man with a family who has to pay for family tickets. If you take the 5-mile radius you can travel 5 miles by rail every day twice, or as much often as you like, first class, for £7 0s. 6d.; second class, £5 5s. 6d. Six miles you can do first class for £8; second class, £6 5s. Going to the remoter distances you can actually travel 10 miles by rail, second class, on an annual ticket for £2 6s; that is as cheaply as you can do a 2 or 3 miles trip by tram.

3523. By Mr. Trewhitt.—Do you mean 10 miles each way?—Yes, you can live 10 miles from Melbourne and travel in and out of town every day in the year as often as you like for that money, so that from the point of view of cost of travel these railways will be a great advantage to the population.

3524. By the Hon. D. McElvain.—And they will pay?—I believe they will pay.

3525. By the Hon. E. Morey.—Do you not think the bicycles will interfere with the paying of the railways?—I think they have already taken a lot of the traffic.

3526. You cannot give the amount?—No; certainly they must have interfered with it. On the other hand, the cyclists who go into the country and get fatigued or their bicycles punctured have to return by train, so there is a gain there, but I believe the loss is greater than the gain.

3527. By Mr. J. S. White.—Can you tell us the reason why the Railway Department charge 10s.; first class for carrying you 3 miles, and they will carry you 6 miles further for 6d.; less?—You would have to ask Mr. Matheson.

3528. He could not explain it when he was here?—Are you sure of your facts?

3529. From Albert Park to Spotswood it is 10s., and from Albert Park to Coburg 1 is 9s. 6d. monthly—you carry them 3 miles and give them a drink?—There must be somebody in or near Coburg who looks after the northern suburbs.

The witness withdraws.

Adjourned.