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DIRECT RAILWAY COMMUNICATION WITH THE
NORTHERN SUBURBS.

REPORT.

The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Railways, to which the Legislative
Assembly referred the question of providing direct communication between the
Northern Suburbs and Melbourne, by railway, have the honour to report as
follows:—

1. This question, which is one of the most important that has been under the
consideration of the present Committee, was referred to them on the 18th August
last. Beyond inspecting the districts interested the Committee were not, however,
able to proceed with the inquiry until the 29th September, pending the preparation
by the Railway Department of necessary estimates of cost and prospective traffic.

Since the latter date a number of witnesses have been examined, who have given
evidence both in favour of and against the proposed direct connexions. These witnesses
include the Railways Commissioner (Mr. Mathieson), the Traffic Manager of the
Victorian Railways, and the Engineer-in-Chief; representatives of the municipal
districts which would be directly benefited by the construction of railways to the
Northern Suburbs; representatives of the Melbourne Tramways Trust, and of
municipalities opposed to the projected lines; the Managing Director of the Melbourne
Tramway and Omnibus Company Limited; and other persons.

The Committee have made themselves thoroughly conversant, not only with
the localities traversed by the projected routes through Collingwood and Fitzroy, but
also with the suburbs beyond those cities, and with the country districts lying further
north and east beyond Heidelberg, Greensborough, Eltham, Diamond Creek, and
Queenstown on the one hand, and Preston, Yan Yean, Arthur's Creek, Epping, and
Whittlesea on the other. They have also been assisted in their investigations by a
number of returns relating not only to the projected connexions, but also to the cost,
revenue, working expenses, and general utility of the north suburban lines which are
in existence at the present time.

2. The claims of the Northern Suburbs to railway facilities have been
strongly and persistently pressed on the notice of successive Governments for many
years past.

An effort was made to meet this demand in 1880, when a Railway Construction
Act was passed (No. 662), which authorized the construction of two lines—one from
North Melbourne, via Royal Park and Brunswick, to Coburg, and another from a
point on the Hawthorn line near its intersection with Chapel-street, in the city of
Richmond, running in a northerly direction, via East Collingwood and Clifton Hill, to
Alphington. Only that portion of the latter railway which lies between Johnston-
street, Collingwood, and Alphington has been built, but the Coburg line was com-
pleted and opened for traffic in 1884. By another Railway Construction Act (No.
821), passed in 1884, the construction of several other lines, running round and into
the outskirts of Fitzroy and Collingwood and through the suburbs and country
districts beyond these cities, were authorized. One of these railways junctions with
the Coburg line in the Royal Park, and runs round North Carlton and North Fitzroy,
to Clifton Hill, where it junctions with the line from Johnston-street, Collingwood.
A short spur, 1 mile in length, runs from the Royal Park-Clifton Hill railway in a
southerly direction and ends on that portion of the Heidelberg-road, within the
boundaries of the city of Fitzroy which is known as Queen's-parade. Another
railway branches off the Royal Park-Clifton Hill railway in North Fitzroy, and, after crossing the Merri Creek, runs through Northcote, Preston, and Yan Yean to Whittlesea. Another line runs from Alphington, via Ivanhoe, to Heidelberg. Still another line branches off the Collingwood-Heidelberg line near Fairfield Park, and runs through Camberwell and Rivardsdale to Oakleigh. This railway is familiarly known as the "Outer Circle."

These railways have a total mileage of 48 1/2 miles, and have cost the sum of £1,169,542, made up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line.</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Cost of Land (£)</th>
<th>Cost of Works (£)</th>
<th>Total Cost, exclusive of Rolling-stock (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Melbourne to Coburg</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49,633</td>
<td>154,986</td>
<td>204,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Park Junction to Clifton Hill</td>
<td>2 1/2</td>
<td>82,268</td>
<td>72,695</td>
<td>154,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy Branch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61,934</td>
<td>14,891</td>
<td>76,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy to Whittlesea</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>91,013</td>
<td>152,815</td>
<td>243,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood to Heidelberg</td>
<td>5 1/2</td>
<td>80,996</td>
<td>108,056</td>
<td>189,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Outer Circle&quot;—Fairfield Park to Oakleigh</td>
<td>12 1/2</td>
<td>114,817</td>
<td>181,718</td>
<td>296,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>48 1/2</strong></td>
<td><strong>485,681</strong></td>
<td><strong>688,861</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,169,542</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Most of these lines were completed and opened for traffic by the end of 1889, and an agitation was at once started for direct railways through Collingwood and Fitzroy, to join the dead ends at Johnston-street, Collingwood, and at Heidelberg-road, Fitzroy, with the suburban railway system at the Flinders-street terminus. A scheme was submitted in the Railway Construction Bill of 1896 for effecting this object, but it was a very costly one, the estimated expenditure amounting to nearly a million sterling, made up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme approved by First Committee</th>
<th>Name of Line</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Cost of Land (£)</th>
<th>Cost of Works (£)</th>
<th>Total Estimated Cost, exclusive of Rolling-stock (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge station to Collingwood station</td>
<td>2 3/4</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>233,464</td>
<td>359,464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge station to Sechselauer-street, Fitzroy</td>
<td>2 1/4</td>
<td>50,785</td>
<td>60,842</td>
<td>111,627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sechselauer-street to Northcote</td>
<td>6 1/8</td>
<td>41,587</td>
<td>60,610</td>
<td>102,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg—line to Northcote (loop line)</td>
<td>0 6/8</td>
<td>28,517</td>
<td>20,916</td>
<td>49,433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 1/8</strong></td>
<td><strong>291,289</strong></td>
<td><strong>619,862</strong></td>
<td><strong>911,151</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. The first Railways Standing Committee investigated this scheme, as well as a number of alternative proposals, and finally came to the conclusion that both the proposed lines through Collingwood and Fitzroy were necessary; but, by altering the routes suggested by the Department, shortening the length of tunnel, cheapening construction on the basis of amended estimates submitted by the then Assistant Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Ronieck), and rejecting the Heidelberg line to Northcote loop, on the ground that it was not necessary if two direct lines were made, they reduced the cost of the proposals submitted to them to a sum of £581,203, made up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme approved by Second Committee</th>
<th>Name of Line</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Cost of Land (£)</th>
<th>Cost of Works (£)</th>
<th>Total Cost, exclusive of Rolling-stock (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge station to Collingwood station, via Wellington-parade</td>
<td>2 3/4</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>138,414</td>
<td>266,414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge station to Sechselauer-street, Fitzroy, via Young-street</td>
<td>2 1/4</td>
<td>164,300</td>
<td>181,621</td>
<td>286,921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sechselauer-street to Northcote</td>
<td>0 6/8</td>
<td>18,857</td>
<td>11,011</td>
<td>29,868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 1/8</strong></td>
<td><strong>250,157</strong></td>
<td><strong>331,046</strong></td>
<td><strong>581,203</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In recommending these lines the Committee expressed the opinion that the districts interested in their construction ought to be made to guarantee the interest
on the cost of the land taken for railway purposes and compensation for damage, until such time as the railways pay working expenses and interest on the cost of construction. This recommendation has been given effect to by the passing of the Railway Lands Acquisition Act 1893 (No. 1288).

5. The scheme submitted to this Committee in August last by the Railway Department is practically the same as that recommended by the first Committee in 1891, but the estimated cost of carrying it out is still further reduced. The lines now proposed by the Department are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Line</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Cost of Land</th>
<th>Cost of Permanent Way Materials</th>
<th>Cost of Works, &amp;c.</th>
<th>Total Cost, exclusive of Rolling-stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge station to Collingwood station, via Wellington-parade</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge station, via Fitzroy, to Northcote (Young-street route)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above scheme, which it will be seen is estimated to cost £475,147 less than the departmental scheme of 1890, and £149,199 less than the scheme recommended by the first Committee in 1891, provides for overland lines at Johnson-street, Collingwood, and at Heidelberg-road, Fitzroy. It also provides for double lines of way, laid with side rails, between Prince's-bridge and Collingwood station, between Prince's-bridge and Fitzroy station, and between the Fitzroy station and Northcote, the double lines on this latter portion being in addition to the single pair of rails on the existing Fitzroy coo Kickstarter, which is to be used, as at present, for goods traffic only. No provision is, however, made in the departmental estimate for duplicating the line between Collingwood and Clifton Hill, which is at present a single line. This duplication is necessary, and is estimated to cost £5,050.

If both the direct lines are constructed, it is proposed to bring the traffic from the Heidelberg line and from the Outer Circle, if re-opened, over the Collingwood route, and to deal with the Northcote, Preston, and Whittlesea traffic, and also that from the direction of North Fitzroy and North Carlton, on the Fitzroy route.

6. On receiving these estimates for two lines the Committee asked to be furnished with alternative estimates, based on the construction of one line only, with the necessary provision for bringing the traffic from the direction of Heidelberg over the Fitzroy route if only that line were constructed; and, on the other hand, for bringing the traffic from the direction of Whittlesea, over the Collingwood route if that line only were made.

If the Fitzroy line only were constructed, and the Heidelberg traffic were carried over it, a connecting railway would be necessary between Northcote and a point on the Heidelberg line near Fairfield Park. It is estimated that this connexion would cost £12,713 for a single line. If the Collingwood line only were made and the Whittlesea traffic were dealt with on it, a connecting line would be necessary between Clifton Hill and Northcote, crossing over the Merri Creek. It is estimated that this connexion would cost £58,470 for a double line.

The total estimated cost to complete these alternative schemes is given as follows:

(a) Fitzroy line with connexion to bring in the Fairfield Park, Alphington, Fitzroy only, Ivanhoe, and Heidelberg traffic, as well as the Northcote, Preston, and Whittlesea traffic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New double line</td>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New single line</td>
<td></td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost of land</td>
<td></td>
<td>£82,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost of permanent-way material</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost of works, &amp;c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>152,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated cost of Fitzroy route with Heidelberg line connexion</td>
<td></td>
<td>£247,242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(6) Collingwood line, with connexion to bring in the Northcote, Preston, and Whittlesea traffic, as well as the Heidelberg traffic —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New double line</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplication of existing line</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total construction</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated cost of land — £55,309
Estimated cost of permanent-way material — £7,200
Estimated cost of works, &c. — £134,176

Total estimated cost of Collingwood route with Whittlesea line connexion — £237,185

7. The Railways Commissioner has furnished the Committee with detailed estimates of the annual charge involved in the construction of the railways referred to in the two preceding paragraphs.

If both lines are constructed as proposed by the Department, it is estimated that the annual cost will be £43,967, of which some of the working expenses will amount to £28,847, and the annual interest charge to £15,120. The working expenses are calculated on the assumption that in working the Fitzroy line there will be a train service to Middle Northcote, equal to that on the St. Kilda line at present (about 66 trains daily each way). The distance from Melbourne to Middle Northcote is about 4 miles. A similar service is proposed on the Collingwood line to terminate at Clifton Hill, a distance of 3 miles from Melbourne. These train services will involve the running of 181,904 train miles on the Fitzroy route, and 136,428 miles on the Collingwood route. The annual interest charge is calculated at a rate of 3½ per cent. on a capital expenditure of £230,319 on the Fitzroy line, and £201,585 on the Collingwood line.

The charges are divided between the two lines as follows:

**Annual working expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fitzroy line</th>
<th>Collingwood line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locomotive expenses</td>
<td>£28,805</td>
<td>£27,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic expenses</td>
<td>£9,970</td>
<td>£4,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent-way expenses</td>
<td>£1,920</td>
<td>£775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total working expenses</td>
<td>£30,795</td>
<td>£33,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on capital expended</td>
<td>£8,063</td>
<td>£7,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£38,858</strong></td>
<td><strong>£40,811</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Fitzroy line only were constructed, with a connexion between Fairfield Park and Northcote for the traffic from the Heidelberg line, it is proposed to run 66 trains daily each way and 40 on Sunday between Middle Northcote and the metropolis; 17 trains daily each way and 7 on Sunday to and from Preston, including the Whittlesea present service; 16 trains daily each way and 8 on Sunday to and from Heidelberg; while between Royal Park Junction and Collingwood a motor service is proposed of 24 trains daily, connecting with the Coburg trains.

The annual cost based on these train services is estimated as follows:

**Annual working expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fitzroy line</th>
<th>Collingwood line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locomotive expenses</td>
<td>£28,805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic expenses</td>
<td>£9,970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent-way expenses</td>
<td>£1,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total working expenses</td>
<td>£30,795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on capital expenditure of</td>
<td>£8,063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£237,082 at 3½ per cent.</td>
<td>£8,646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total annual cost—interest and</td>
<td>£29,146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assuming that only the Collingwood line were constructed, with a connection between Clifton Hill and Northcote for the traffic from the Whittlesea line, it is proposed to run 66 trains daily each way, and 10 trains on Sunday, between Clifton Hill or Middle Northcote and the Melbourne terminus; 17 trains daily each way, and 7 on Sunday, between Melbourne and Preston, including the Whittlesea present service; and 16 trains daily each way, and 8 on Sunday, between Heidelberg and Melbourne. Between Royal Park Junction and Clifton Hill a motor service of 24 trains daily is proposed, connecting with the Coburg trains.

The annual cost based on these train services is estimated to amount to—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual working expenses</th>
<th>£10,927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locomotive expenses</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic expenses</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent-way expenses</td>
<td>9,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total working expenses</td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest on capital expenditure of £237,185 at 3\% per cent.

Total annual cost — interest and working expenses: £28,589

8. In addition to the estimates of cost and working expenses the Committee estimates that the revenue likely to be derived from these alternative schemes. With the exception of a comparatively small sum for the carriage of parcels, the estimated revenue is based solely on passenger traffic.

In order to obtain a reliable basis on which to estimate the prospective passenger traffic, careful inquiry has been made by the Traffic Manager as to the present train traffic to and from the Northern Suburbs, and the present traffic both by rail and tram to and from districts south of the Yarra as nearly as possible similar in the Northern Suburbs. The southern districts which have been taken are Richmond (including East Richmond and Burnley) and South Melbourne (including Albert Park).

The Richmond population is stated at 32,529 persons, who travel 3,758,279 times a year by rail and tram, or 115 journeys per head of the population; the average number of journeys per head by rail being 67, and by tram 48. The South Melbourne population is 35,112, who travel 3,391,963 times a year by rail and tram, or 105 journeys per head of population. Of this number 48 journeys are by rail, and 57 by tram.

Taking the average number of rail journeys for the two districts—67 and 48—an average number of 58 rail journeys to and from Melbourne, Albert Park, North Melbourne, Richmond, East Richmond, and Burnley is obtained. In estimating the revenue for the Northern Suburbs lines, this average is taken for the population credited to the Collingwood line, while an average of 50 journeys is taken for the Fitzroy line, the number being reduced on account of the present train service through Fitzroy. The average number of journeys per head of the population of Fitzroy and Collingwood at present, by tram only, is 92.

The average fare per passenger to be received from those using the Northern Suburbs lines is estimated at 1d., which is the average rate on the Preston line at present.

In estimating the number of passengers likely to be carried by rail if both lines were constructed, the population within the boundaries of the city of Fitzroy—which extends on the east to Smith-street and on the west to Nicholson-street—is credited to the Fitzroy line; the present population of Fitzroy City is stated at 29,900. The population (30,525) of the city of Collingwood, which is bounded on the west by Smith-street and on the east by the River Yarra; also the population of Albert Ward in the city of Melbourne (3,569), and of North Ward in the city of Richmond (3,000)—a total population of 37,925—is credited to the Collingwood line.
If both lines are constructed the prospective revenue calculated on the basis described is estimated as follows:

\[ (a) \text{ Fitzroy Line.} \]

Population of Fitzroy, 29,060; 50 journeys per head at 1/4d. each ... ... ... ... £9,063

"Foreign" bookings—that is, bookings to and from other suburbs—33 per cent. of "local" revenue ... ... 3,021

Present bookings from Preston line to North Fitzroy and vice versa, 51,331. Assuming 50 per cent. of these travel further citywards at average of 1/4d. each ... 107

Present traffic from Preston line to Flinders-street and North Melbourne transferred to new line, 586,600 at 1/4d. each ... ... ... ... 3,666

Add 33 per cent. for increased traffic consequent on direct route and more frequent service ... ... ... ... 1,222

Present bookings to North Fitzroy from Whittlesea line and vice versa, 10,428. Assuming 65 per cent. of these travel on to the terminus at 1/4d. each ... ... ... ... 45

Present bookings to Flinders-street, Spencer-street, and North Melbourne from Whittlesea line and vice versa, 14,533. Credit these to new line at 1/4d. each ... ... ... ... 91

Parcels and sundry traffic ... ... ... ... ... ... 1,037

Total ... ... ... ... ... ... £18,250

\[ (b) \text{ Collingwood Line.} \]

Population of Collingwood City, Albert Ward, Melbourne, and North Ward, Richmond, 57,925; 58 journeys per head at 1/4d. each ... ... ... ... £13,422

"Foreign" bookings, 33 per cent. of "local" revenue ... ... ... ... 4,474

Present traffic from Heidelberg line to Glenor Hill and Collingwood and vice versa, 300,000 passengers per annum. Assuming 66 per cent. of these will go on to terminus at 1/4d. ... ... ... ... 1,250

Add 50 per cent. for increased traffic consequent on direct route and more frequent service ... ... ... ... 525

Parcels and sundry traffic ... ... ... ... ... ... 1,000

Total ... ... ... ... ... ... £20,771

The total revenue from the two lines will, therefore, it is estimated, amount to £39,021.

9. In estimating the number of passengers likely to be carried if the Fitzroy line only is constructed, with the connexion to bring in the traffic from the Heidelberg line, half the population of Barkly, Darling, and Loch wards, in the city of Collingwood, is taken into account in addition to the population of Fitzroy. The prospective revenue is then estimated as follows:

Population of Fitzroy, 29,060; 50 journeys per head, at 1/4d. each ... ... ... ... ... ... £9,063

Population of Collingwood, estimated to use Fitzroy line—half of Barkly, Darling, and Loch wards, 10,000—or, say, 33 per cent. of 29,063 ... ... ... 3,021

"Foreign" bookings, 33 per cent. of "local" revenue ... ... ... 4,028

Present traffic, Heidelberg line to Collingwood and vice versa, 300,000 per annum, assuming 66 per cent. go to Melbourne via Fitzroy, at 1/4d. each ... ... ... ... 1,250

Add 50 per cent. for increase consequent on direct route and more frequent service ... ... ... 625

Revenue if only Fitzroy line constructed.
Present traffic from Preston line to Flinders-street and North Melbourne, transferred to new line, 586,000, at 1½d. each ... ... ... ... ... ... £3,666
Add 33 per cent. for increased traffic consequent on direct route and more frequent service ... ... ... ... ... ... 1,222
Present bookings to North Fitzroy from Whittlesea line and vice versa, 10,428, assuming 66 per cent. travel on to terminus at 1½d. each ... ... ... ... ... ... 43
Present bookings to Flinders-street, Spencer-street, and North Melbourne from Whittlesea line and vice versa, 14,553. Credit these to new line at 1½d. each ... ... ... ... ... ... 91
Parcels and sundry traffic ... ... ... ... ... ... 1,379
Total revenue for Fitzroy route with Heidelberg line connexion ... ... ... ... ... ... £24,379

10. In estimating the number of passengers likely to be carried if the Collingwood line only is constructed, with the connexion to bring in the traffic from the Whittlesea line, half of Clifton Ward, one-quarter of East Ward, and one-sixth of Central Ward, in the city of Fitzroy, or about 5,000 persons are taken into account in addition to the population of Collingwood City, Albert Ward, Melbourne, and North Ward, Richmond.

The prospective revenue for the route is then estimated by the Department as follows:

Population of Collingwood City, Albert Ward, Melbourne, and North Ward, Richmond, 37,625; 58 journeys per head at 1½d. each ... ... ... ... ... ... £13,422
Population of Fitzroy estimated to use the Collingwood line, 5,000 persons, or about one-sixth of the Fitzroy population, calculated at 30 journeys per head—say, one-sixth of Fitzroy revenue ... ... ... ... ... ... 1,510
"Foreign" bookings, 33 per cent. of "local" revenue, say, £1,350, £225, £3,666, £1,222, £43, £91, £1,379 ... ... ... ... ... ... 9,867
Total revenue for Collingwood route with Whittlesea line connexion ... ... ... ... ... ... £28,199

11. On the basis of these departmental estimates of capital cost, annual charges, and prospective revenue, the three schemes therefore compare as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme</th>
<th>Length to Construct</th>
<th>Estimated Cost, exchange of Tolling-stock</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Cost—Working Expenses and Interest</th>
<th>Estimated Revenue</th>
<th>Estimated Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two lines—Prince's-bridge station to Collingwood station, and Prince's-bridge station to Northcote, and Fitzroy ...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>£432,004</td>
<td>£43,967</td>
<td>£39,621</td>
<td>£4,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy line, with single line connexion between Northcote and the Heidelberg line ... ...</td>
<td>4-92</td>
<td>247,032</td>
<td>28,446</td>
<td>24,379</td>
<td>4,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood line with double line connexion between Clifton Hill and Northcote, and duplication of existing line between Collingwood and Clifton Hill ... ...</td>
<td>3-58</td>
<td>235,183</td>
<td>25,589</td>
<td>28,199</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are estimates of profit and loss on the proposed connexions only, and do not show the contingent advantages which the Railway Department will derive therefrom. The railway officials examined state that with the direct lines the present heavy annual loss on the railways beyond the Northern Suburbs will be materially...
lessened: that the capital sunk in building the outer lines will be rendered reproductive; that the traffic on the suburban railway system generally will be improved; and that the contemplated re-arrangement of the metropolitan terminal stations can be carried out in a manner that will admit of a large annual saving being effected.

Apart from these important considerations, which are dealt with later, the evidence shows that the foregoing estimates of revenue are very low. The Traffic Manager states that in estimating the prospective revenue he has "rigidly kept low, and purposely," while Mr. Mathieson states that "the figures given in, are rather under than over estimated, and there is ample margin to fully realize them." If the revenue is estimated on a mileage basis, the sums which have been set down amount, the Traffic Manager states, to £6,000 per mile for the Collingwood, and £4,500 per mile for the Fitzroy railway, while the Engineer-in-Chief points out that the population is denser in the Northern Suburbs than in the Southern; and that the actual revenue from the South Suburban lines—Port Melbourne, St. Kilda, Brighton, and Hawthorn—amounts to £20,000 per mile. In the Engineer-in-Chief's opinion, if £10,000 per mile is taken as the estimate of revenue for the North Suburban direct lines it would be a low estimate. Such a return would leave a handsome profit on both the Fitzroy and Collingwood lines after paying working expenses and interest on the capital proposed to be expended.

The estimated average number of journeys per head of the population—58 for Collingwood City and 50 for Fitzroy City—is also very low when compared with the suburban system as a whole, and a population of at least 30,000, outside the boundaries of the cities of Fitzroy and Collingwood will be served by the direct connections. Mr. Remnick gave the following interesting evidence on these points:—

112. * * * * * * * * * As to the possibilities of the suburban traffic, I took the trouble to ascertain the suburban railway traffic and the tramway traffic. The railways last year carried 26,000,000 passengers—the tramways nearly the same, or 34,000,000; or together 70,000,000 of suburban passengers. If you take that in a population of 400,000 (and I do not think more than 400,000 of the metropolitan population is accommodated with tram and railway), it would give 175 passengers per head of population served.

288. * * * * * * * * * * * I may tell you further, as regards the number of people who travel by tram and trains, that a recent estimate for the city of New York was made, showing that for every head of a population amounting to 1,000,000 they are estimated to travel 260 times a year. The Melbourne population is a very travelling population. I think they travel about 140 times for every head, and I think that that north suburban population will ultimately reach a figure like that I mentioned, to be divided between the tram and railway.

290. You calculate on a larger population than we have at present?—No. In my estimate of revenue I only allowed for each person travelling 100 times. As to the Commissioner's estimate of 58 times, I do not know how that is arrived at. In the case of the population, he has not counted any of the outside population; he has only taken the population of the two municipalities or two cities.

The evidence shows further that the sum set down in the estimate of revenue for parcels—£1,000 on each line—is low, and that considerable revenue is likely to be derived from the carriage of parcels and goods which can be brought by mixed trains from the Eltham and Whittlesea districts whence large quantities of fruit and dairy produce are sent to the markets in Fitzroy, Collingwood, Melbourne, and the southern suburbs.

The last Report of the Victorian Railways Commissioner shows, that the present parcels traffic on the Fitzroy to Whittlesea, and the Collingwood to Heidelberg lines, yields a revenue of—

| Outwards parcels | ... | ... | £2,870 |
| Inwards parcels | ... | ... | 2,416 |

while the goods traffic on the same lines is as follows:—

| Outwards goods | ... | 33,984 | £2,234 |
| Inwards goods | ... | 77,557 | 30,088 |

12. In their evidence before the Committee the Railways Commissioner and the officers of the Department have called particular attention to the very serious annual loss on the existing lines beyond the Northern Suburbs, and have pointed out the hopelessness of reducing that loss to any material extent while the lines remain as they are at present. Taking the lines which would be immediately affected
if the direct connections proposed by the Department were carried out, the approximate loss for the year ending 30th June last amounted to £16,670; the loss on working being £12,844, and the interest on the cost of construction £3,826. The loss on each line is given as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Cost of track (£)</th>
<th>Cost of Works (£)</th>
<th>Lost Revenue (£)</th>
<th>Interest on Capital (£)</th>
<th>Full Road Loss (£)</th>
<th>Full Post Loss (£)</th>
<th>Full Post Mile Loss (Miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy to Whitley...</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>246,825</td>
<td>6,369</td>
<td>14,294</td>
<td>7,583</td>
<td>9,350</td>
<td>23,057</td>
<td>17,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Park to Clifton Hill (including Fitzroy branch line)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>231,753</td>
<td>4,862</td>
<td>7,586</td>
<td>2,897</td>
<td>9,387</td>
<td>19,516</td>
<td>12,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood to Heidelberg</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>189,054</td>
<td>4,840</td>
<td>7,022</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>7,602</td>
<td>14,584</td>
<td>9,744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portion of &quot;Outer Circle&quot; (Fairfield Park to Riverdale), closed for traffic</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>178,000</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>7,144</td>
<td>7,144</td>
<td>7,144</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Coburg line is included the annual loss is increased to £60,728, of which sum £18,745 is loss on working and £41,983 interest on construction. This line will only be slightly affected by the construction of the direct connections if the department continue working it as at present through Spencer-street to Finders-street. A suggestion has, however, been made that if the traffic were taken along the Fitzroy connexion it could be dealt with more profitably; that the heavy loss in working would be materially reduced; and that the passenger traffic would be greatly increased by reason of the fact that the trains would run through a dense population the whole way instead of through the sparsely settled district now traversed. The Commissioner is not, however, at present prepared to say that he can recommend the adoption of such a course, although he thinks it is deserving of consideration.

The evidence as to the large annual deficit on the other lines mentioned, and the prospects of reducing the same if the direct connections are made is very explicit.

Mr. Mathieson says—

"3023. Do you think you will be able to reduce these 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 the plan submitted to the Committee.

"3024. If those connections were made, do you think from your knowledge gained 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 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 materially on these lines, but without that direct connexion I do not see any immediate prospect of improving matters whatever."

"3025. Then I understood you briefly to say that we ran no risk of increasing the annual deficit on the railways if we make 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 being 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 our working expenses and interest.

"3026. You gave the reasons for four lines; you think that loss will be reduced to 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 as the various lines.

"3027. Then I am right that you contemplate a reduction of the present loss, and you have no doubt that within a year or two this new policy is to 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, so far as I can judge, the only way of reducing our present loss on the lines that have been constructed.

The Traffic Manager, Mr. Fitzpatrick, who had a lengthened experience in the working of the suburban passenger traffic, supports the Commissioner's opinion. He states—

"579. * * * One of the strongest arguments in my mind why those lines should be constructed is that there are other lines that will never be commensurate except by making these.

"581. You will save the loss?—I think we will gradually wipe it out."

\[^*\text{3023, 3024, 3025, 3026, 3027, 579, 581.} \text{By} \text{Miltons}\]
There is no doubt that the loss on these outer lines is a matter which greatly affects the question as to whether it is advisable to incur the expenditure proposed on the direct connections. As these outer lines stand today they altogether fail to meet the requirements of the public and present a most regrettable spectacle of wasteful expenditure and unprofitability. They have been located with singular want of judgment and foresight, and carried out at a cost which far exceeds the original estimate submitted to Parliament when authorizing the lines. The Fitzroy spur, one mile in length, which was estimated to cost £11,876, and which has actually cost £76,818, is at present used for goods traffic only, and will not be used for passengers unless connected with the Prince's Bridge terminus. The "Outer Circle," which Parliament authorized on an estimate of £150,000 has cost £298,562, and is at present closed for traffic. It cannot be utilized for passenger traffic without a direct connection with the city. It forms a factor in the case for the Collingwood line according to the evidence of the Traffic Manager, who states—

"There is there is no such district, and the terminus at Fairfield Park to Cobram which can ever be populated, and yield a sufficient rate of revenue, and possess those moral beauties that with a direct line it would have a large population."

Its position as a feeder to a direct line is stated in the evidence given by the Mayor of Kew as follows:—

"The northern and eastern portions of Kew can be practically considered to be without railway communication at all; and we think it one of these lines is constructed it would open up the whole district."

"The Fitzroy spur, one mile in length, which was estimated to cost £11,876, and which has actually cost £76,818, is at present used for goods traffic only, and will not be used for passengers unless connected with the Prince's Bridge terminus. The "Outer Circle," which Parliament authorized on an estimate of £150,000 has cost £298,562, and is at present closed for traffic. It cannot be utilized for passenger traffic without a direct connection with the city. It forms a factor in the case for the Collingwood line according to the evidence of the Traffic Manager, who states—

"There is there is no such district, and the terminus at Fairfield Park to Cobram which can ever be populated, and yield a sufficient rate of revenue, and possess those moral beauties that with a direct line it would have a large population."

This and other evidence leads to the belief that with a direct connexion, the large amount of capital sunk on this Outer Circle line might be rendered reproductive. In the case of the Heidelberg line, although there is a connexion with Spencer-street by Collingwood and Royal Park, practically the whole of the traffic which amounts to 500,000 passengers per annum is carried by the trains to and from the Johnston-street station. The trains would now have to travel 1½ miles to get from Heidelberg to the Flinders-street station, Melbourne, and it would take 14 minutes to do the journey. With the Collingwood direct connexion the distance would be reduced to ½ mile and the time taken over the journey to 29 minutes. To get from the Flinders-street station to Johnston-street, Collingwood, by the present lines would entail a train journey of 8 miles, occupying 30 minutes. With the direct line the journey would be ½ mile and would occupy 30 minutes. In the case of Northcote, the present distance from Melbourne by rail is 6½ miles and the travelling time 26 minutes. With the direct connexion the Fitzroy journey would be reduced to ½ mile and the time to thirteen minutes. Trains to Northcote, Heidelberg, and other places on the existing lines are now run at long intervals. It will not pay to run a frequent service such a roundabout way. Business people consequently use the trains. With the quick service, at short intervals, proposed on the direct lines, it is expected that the railways would get practically the whole of the traffic from the outer suburbs.

15. The Railway Department anticipates that the building of the direct lines will have a most beneficial effect on the whole suburban railway system. The Commissioner states that the capital expended on railway lines and works within a radius of 10 miles of Melbourne amounts to less than £7,287,449; and he adds—

"It will be readily apparent that the joining up of the various lines around the city by means of the railways proposed will be of immense benefit, by assisting to render more largely productive the large sum already spent." As showing the importance of the suburban railway traffic, it may be stated that for the year ending 30th June last 35,958,852 passengers were carried on the lines within the 10-mile radius, and a revenue of £265,592 was derived from passengers only, exclusive of the returns from parcels and goods, &c. To obtain this revenue 2,287,771 train miles were run, giving an average income from passengers of 3s. 3d. per train mile. The working expenses per train mile have not been ascertained, but the Commissioner states that such expenses would be about half the revenue, certainly not more than 2s. per train mile.

It is expected, and the evidence shows that the expectation is reasonable, that there will be a large interchange of traffic between the Northern and Southern...

..."
Suburbs; the traffic on the lines running to the sea-side—Brighton, St. Kilda, and Port Melbourne—being specially increased. A large number of people, many of whom are stated to come from the Southern Suburbs, now visit the various trading establishments in Smith-street, which is a very busy thoroughfare. Evidence was given to the Committee that the average attendance at one place of business alone amounted to from 1,000 to 2,000 on ordinary days, and from 10,000 to 20,000 on show days. The railways will, no doubt, obtain their share of this traffic if proper facilities are provided. It may be stated that the Department have benefited to the extent of upwards of £12,000 per annum, by meeting the public convenience in bringing the traffic from Essendon and the other North-eastern suburbs into the Flinders-street station.

In addition to an increase of revenue the Department also anticipates being able to largely reduce the working expenses by extending the system of running through trains from one suburb to another. This mode of working the traffic is strongly advocated by the Commissioner and by his officers. The wisdom of such a course was also urged by Mr. Kiley, the Chairman of the New South Wales Railways Commissioners, when the Committee sought his advice on the suitability of the plan proposed for the central passenger station at Flinders-street. No provision was made in that plan for bringing in the Northern Suburbs lines, but Mr. Matheson proposes to do so, and thus complete the suburban railway system of Melbourne. His evidence on these points has an important bearing on the question of constructing the direct lines. He states—

"1892.

Looking at things all round, is the way we propose to work the service through Flinders-street station, we really want an outlet for both lines. Instead of having Flinders-street as the terminus, we propose to make the termini on the outskirts of the city.

"1892. Do you think you would work the whole of that traffic in Flinders-street?—I do.

"1892. Would it reduce the present cost of these two stations?—Yes; by dispersing with Prince'sbridge station we believe we could save £7,000 per annum. By putting the additional train service through Flinders-street, it might reduce the £7,000 to about £6,000; but that, of course, we can see the outside of our own expenditure for staff.

"1892. Would it assist to make the lines pay to have access backwards and forwards from the northern suburbs to the southern?—Most materially. Look at the Stratton Company: they run from Stanley Park to St. Kilda, and from Stanley Park to Brunswick and, as far as they can, they endeavor 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 handed over from the Prince'sbridge station to the Prince'sbridge Company. These lines would enable us to complete the circle, and so carry our passengers on the whole of their journey, instead of putting them to the expense of taking a train to go to the Prince'sbridge station or to get to their destination is 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 these through lines would be of immense assistance to the people living outside of Melbourne and 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 cab to carry their luggage from one train to another. These trains would be continuous, or would merely transfer from one platform to another at Flinders-street."

14. The Committee were most anxious to ascertain whether it was not practicable to serve the Northern Suburbs by one direct connection, and with that object in view they obtained the alternative estimates already referred to, firstly, for the connection of the Fitzroy line with a connecting loop between Northcote and Fairfield Park, to bring in the Heidelberg traffic and, secondly, for the Collingwood line with a connection between Northcote and Clifton Hill to bring the Preston and Whittlesea traffic over the Collingwood route.

There are several objections to the scheme for making the Fitzroy railway and the connecting loop. The expensive line which has been built between Johnson-street, Collingwood, and Fairfield Park would be left standing useless. A large portion of the thinly populated city of Collingwood and the north ward of Richmond would be left without railway facilities, and if the Collingwood connection were made hereafter, the Northcote to Fairfield Park loop, costing £16,153, would be unnecessary. On the other hand, if the Collingwood railway with the Clifton Hill to Northcote line were built, the expensive Fitzroy spur line would be left in its present useless condition; the people of Fitzroy, North Carlen and North Fitzroy would be left without railway facilities, and in the event of the Fitzroy line being hereafter made, the £25,470 expended on the Northcote to Clifton Hill loop would be simply thrown away. Similar objections apply to other connecting schemes for lines along Reilly-street and south of Johnston-street.
The evidence of the expert officers of the Department is strongly opposed to the construction of the outer connecting loop lines and in favour of the construction of both the Collinswood and Fitzroy direct lines, preference being given to the Collinswood line in choosing which line should be first built. Some of the evidence given on this point may be quoted. Mr. Matthewson's evidence is as follows:—

"3161. I do not know whether you give any preference only one line to be constructed?—No.

I said it would be a great pity to spend money in making those outer 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.

"3162. 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 Collinswood; but I say it would be a great pity, as to those two lines that could be constructed without loss in the country and would give such enormous assistance to the country, that either the one or the other should be dropped.

"3163. If we constructed only one line, would you think the Collinswood line should be chosen? Why?—And if it were merely a question of calling for tenders for one line or the other.

I would say the Collinswood line should be chosen. Why?—I said it would be a great pity to do anything of the kind, because it would not enable us to give a service to the district, and utilize our present service through Flinders-street.

"3165. Then your answer is, if we cannot construct both, we had better construct one at all?—I would not say that, but I say it is hardly fair to put it that way, because I think both lines are equally entitled to the consideration that they ask for. Of course they must have the will of Parliament and I can only express my opinion.

"3167. You cannot express the answer 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 that both lines should be constructed, but if it were only a question of calling for tenders, I would say Collinswood first. The reason is, that 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 the old lines go to Flinders-street and the service there are from both lines.

"3169. I feel the Committee recommend only one line which of the two would be best if they cannot construct both?—I am afraid I cannot answer that."

Mr. Fitzpatrick, the Traffic Manager, states in reply to questions—

"480. Do you think it would pay with the two lines as well as with only one?—I think the Collinswood line would pay from the start. It is the Fitzroy might not pay for a little while, but would ultimately.

I am in favour of both, only being constructed.

"481. Unless the two lines were constructed, would you oppose constructing any?—The case to my mind is this: I am strongly in favour of both being constructed; I am not in favour of either one singly, for this reason—that although you might carry the traffic over one early at the start, there would be such development of the northern suburbs outside the city limits of Fitzroy and Collinswood that a great increase would have to take place in the train service.

"482. The question with us is, if it is not practicable to recommend the two lines, which of the two do you think should be constructed?—I think the Collinswood line of the two, but I am strongly of opinion that both should be constructed."

The Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Remick, gave the following evidence:—

"3. Do you propose, as the best scheme, that the two lines should be constructed?—Yes, I think so, to serve the population.

"75. If you were asked to recommend the people, and did not see your way to make two lines, you would give the one or the other rather than put one line in the entire?—Yes; I could do that first, and hope that the other would be built at some future time.

"184. You have pointed out very clearly that two lines are necessary eventually, but that one line should be made before the other?—No. If one line is made before the other, which it should be, it was the question, and I said Collinswood. That is my opinion; it has always been my opinion.

"185. Is that the sole reason you have given. In a letter we have there is a table shows the working of one and a line over the other?—That does not come from my estimate of revenue and working. I think the population of Collinswood makes it more than the other.

..."

In addition to what may be termed the departmental reasons for connecting the dead ends at Heidelberg-road, Fitzroy, and at Johnston-street, Collinswood, with the Flinders-street terminus, the claims to direct railway facilities of the residents of the Northern Suburbs and the country districts beyond those suburbs have been strongly pressed on the Committee by the various municipalities interested.

Representatives and residents of the Cities of Fitzroy, Collinswood, and Richmond, the Town of Northcote, the Borough of Kew, and the Shires of Preston, Kew, Whittlesea, Heidelberg, and Epping, have given evidence in favour of the lines. They have urged that they are subjected to great inconvenience at present,
and that the district is retarded for want of similar railway facilities to those so long enjoyed by the southern suburbs. They point out, further, that while they have been called upon to pay their share of the large annual deficiency arising through the construction of country railways which cannot for years to come pay the cost of working, their claims to the construction of direct lines which will not only pay in themselves, but which will also greatly improve the returns from existing railways, have been persistently ignored.

16. The Committee have not confined themselves to hearing evidence in favour of the proposed lines, but have also afforded the fullest opportunity to those desiring to give evidence against them. The cities of Melbourne and South Melbourne, two municipalities out of twelve represented on the Tramways Trust, sent representatives to oppose the construction of the lines. The Mayor of St. Kilda (Councillor Stedifold), Mr. Hamilton, the Secretary of the Tramway Trust; and Mr. Clapp, the Managing Director of the Tramway Company, also attended at the request of the Committee, and were examined on the question. The large interest which the metropolitan municipalities have in the tramways and the relations of the Trust and the Company were explained to the Committee by these witnesses.

The Trust is composed of eighteen members, representing twelve municipalities, viz.:—Melbourne, Collingwood, Fitzroy, Richmond, Prahran, St. Kilda, Port Melbourne, Brunswick, North Melbourne, South Melbourne, Hawthorn, and Kew. The capital of the Tramway Company is £189,000, in 960,000 shares paid up to 19s. The Trust borrowed £2,550,000 to build the tramways, and leased them to the Company for a period of 52 years. The lease expires in July, 1916. The Company pays interest at 63 per cent. on the sum borrowed by the Trust. The interest amounts to about £14,250 per annum. The total payments for interest to 30th June last amounted to £619,523. The Company has also to pay about £50,750 per annum into a sinking fund, which is invested by the Trust and gradually accumulates. It is intended that this sinking fund shall, by the year 1916, be sufficient to pay off the sum borrowed to build the tram lines and engine-houses. The sinking fund now amounts to about £830,000. The Company also guarantees the expenses of the Trust up to £1,000 per annum, and it pays annually to a reserve account a sum for maintenance and renewals. The amount to the credit of this reserve fund is now about £190,500. A payment of £9,000 per annum for rates on the property of the Company is also made to the municipalities, who, in addition, receive a licence-fee of 25 each on the cars and "grip" cars used by the Company. The municipalities derive a further benefit from the Company by having a width of about 17 feet of the streets traversed by the trams kept in splendid order. Notwithstanding all these heavy payments, the Company is so well managed that it is able to pay a 5 per cent. dividend to its shareholders now, while in past years the dividend has been much larger. The tram lines in the Northern Suburbs are the best paying ones the Company has; it is therefore not surprising that it should desire to prevent any encroachment on an area where it has at present a monopoly.

The Committee have given careful attention to the evidence submitted to them in opposition to the construction of the direct lines. The evidence is, however, somewhat contradictory. It is urged on the one hand that the proposed railways cannot compete with the trams, and will get very little traffic, and on the other hand that the railways will have such a serious effect on the tram traffic that the Company may, after exhausting their resources, have to throw the whole concern on the municipalities forming the Tramways Trust. The Committee think the truth is between these two statements, and that while the number of passengers now travelling will probably be greatly increased with the better facilities afforded, both the railways and the trams will get a fair share of the traffic. The witnesses interested in the trams, moreover, do not take into consideration the great annual loss which the State has to bear on the outer railways, and the capital which has been sunk on those lines. The Committee think the public reasons for the construction of the proposed railways outweigh the objections raised by the Tramway Company and the municipal representatives who have given evidence against the lines. This view is strongly supported by the Railways Commissioner in the following evidence:

"...You have very little fear that if we authorize this additional distance we shall be doing anything wrong.—I do say so. I think the Committee will be acting properly; but go further, I think it is very far from just to say that the Department having been put to the heavy outlay of building additional lines round the city, should be stopped from giving the public the convenience that they demand, at the instance of a private corporation."
17. Various other proposals for supplying the Northern Suburbs with railway communication have been brought under the notice of the Committee, and evidence has been taken with regard to some of them.

One of the schemes inquired into was designed by Mr. P. W. Millane, an officer of the Crown Lands Department. He proposes to bring the Fitzroy line on a viaduct, from its present terminus, down Hoddle-street and along Alexandra-parade and Nicholson-street to the site of the Model Schools. He also proposes to bring the Collingwood line on a viaduct from its present terminus along Hoddle-street and Victoria-parade to the Model Schools, and then to extend the combined lines, partly on viaduct and partly in tunnel, down Lonsdale-street to Spencer-street station.

In addition to other stopping places he provides stations at the Model Schools and between Swanston-street and Elizabeth-street in Lonsdale-street.

Mr. Millane claims that by his scheme passengers would be deposited in the centre of the city instead of at Flinders-street, and that very little land would be required, and, consequently, very little compensation would have to be paid if his proposals were adopted. He states that his scheme is estimated to cost £214,000. The Engineer-in-Chief estimates that it will cost £588,475, or £156,471 more than the estimated expenditure required to carry out both the proposed lines from Prince’s-bridge to Collingwood and Prince’s-bridge to Northcote via Fitzroy. Copies of the Engineer-in-Chief’s report and the detailed estimates accompanying it are attached.

Evidence has been given by several witnesses against Mr. Millane’s scheme.

No one came forward to give evidence in its favour.

Another scheme, for an underground railway, suggested by Mr. McGregor, a civil engineer, residing in Melbourne, is described fully in a paper handed in by this witness and printed with the Minutes of Evidence, page 170. In the opinion of the Committee, the objection to Mr. McGregor’s suggestion is the length of the tunnels which he proposes.

The Committee have also considered the Report and evidence of the first Railways Standing Committee on the numerous schemes dealt with by that body in 1891.

After most careful inquiry, the Committee are convinced that the routes via Young-street, for the Fitzroy line, and via Wellington-parade, for the Collingwood line, which were originated by the first Committee in 1891, and which have been adopted by the Department after permanent survey, are better than any others which have been suggested.

18. The Committee have come to the conclusion that both the Fitzroy and Collingwood direct railways should be constructed, but that the Collingwood line should be built first. They therefore recommenced the construction of the Collingwood line now, and that the Fitzroy line be constructed at the expiration of two years.

The construction of the railways to be subject to the provisions of Part II. of the Railway Lands Acquisition Act 1893.

19. The following extracts from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Committee show the divisions that took place during the consideration of this question:

WEDNESDAY, 9th DECEMBER, 1896.

The Committee proceeded to consider the evidence taken with regard to the question of direct railway communication with the Northern Suburbs.

Mr. Trethew moved, That in the opinion of the Committee it is expedient that direct railway communication should be provided between the Northern Suburbs and Melbourne.

Debate adjourned.

And the debate not being concluded by the time appointed for the meeting of Parliament—Ordered—That the debate be adjourned until to-morrow.

THURSDAY, 10th DECEMBER, 1896.

Debate resumed on the motion moved by Mr. Trethew, viz.—That in the opinion of the Committee it is expedient that direct railway communication should be provided between the Northern Suburbs and Melbourne.

Mr. Craven moved, as an amendment, That the following words be added to the motion, viz.—

"On condition that no railway shall be commenced until the municipalities interested, or any of them, shall give a satisfactory guarantee that the revenue derived from such railway shall be sufficient to pay working expenses and 1 per cent per annum interest on the capital cost, such guarantee to continue in force for five years."

Debate continued.

And the debate not being concluded by the time appointed for the meeting of Parliament—Ordered—That the debate be adjourned until Tuesday next.
TUESDAY, 13th DECEMBER, 1896.

Debate resumed on Mr. Trewhitt's motion and Mr. Craven's amendment.

Question—That the following words be added to the motion moved by Mr. Trewhitt, viz.:

"On condition that no railway shall be commenced until the municipalities interested, or any of them, shall give a satisfactory guarantee that the revenue derived from such railway shall be sufficient to pay working expenses and 4 per cent. per annum interest on the capital cost, such guarantee to continue in force for five years."—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes. 1.  
Mr. Craven.  

Noes. 8.  
The Chairman,  
Mr. Buchanan,  
Mr. Brown,  
Mr. Harris,  
Mr. Melville,  
Mr. Money,  
Mr. Trewhitt,  
Mr. J. S. White.

And so it passed in the negative.

Question—that in the opinion of the Committee it is expedient that direct railway communication should be provided between the Northern Suburbs and Melbourne—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 5.  
The Chairman,  
Mr. Buchanan,  
Mr. Melville,  
Mr. Money,  
Mr. Trewhitt.  

Noes, 4.  
Mr. Burton,  
Mr. Craven,  
Mr. Harris,  
Mr. J. S. White.

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

The Committee adjourned until to-morrow.

WEDNESDAY, 16th DECEMBER, 1896.

Mr. Trewhitt moved, That in the opinion of the Committee both the Fitzroy and Collingwood connections should be made, as recommended by the Railways Commissioner, the Traffic Manager, and the Engineer-in-Chief.

Debate ensued.

Mr. Craven moved, as an amendment, That the following words be added to the motion, viz.:

"On condition that no railway shall be commenced until the municipalities interested, or any of them, shall give a satisfactory guarantee that the revenue to be derived from such railway shall be sufficient to pay the working expenses thereof, and also 4 per cent. per annum interest on the capital cost of such line, such guarantee to continue in force for five years."

Debate resumed.

Question—that the words proposed to be added be so added—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 1.  
Mr. Craven.  

Noes, 8.  
The Chairman,  
Mr. Buchanan,  
Mr. Burton,  
Mr. Harris,  
Mr. Melville,  
Mr. Money,  
Mr. Trewhitt,  
Mr. J. S. White.

And so it passed in the negative.

Question—that in the opinion of the Committee both the Fitzroy and Collingwood connections should be made, as recommended by the Railways Commissioner, the Traffic Manager, and the Engineer-in-Chief—put.

The Committee divided.

Ayes, 4.  
The Chairman,  
Mr. Buchanan,  
Mr. Melville,  
Mr. Trewhitt.  

Noes, 5.  
Mr. Burton,  
Mr. Craven,  
Mr. Harris,  
Mr. Money,  
Mr. J. S. White.

And so it passed in the negative.

Mr. Trewhitt moved, That the Committee recommend the construction of the Collingwood line.

Debate resumed.

Mr. Melville moved, as an amendment, That the word "Collingwood" be omitted, with a view to insert in place thereof the word "Fitzroy," and that the following words be added to the motion, viz.:

"now, and that the Collingwood line be constructed at the expiration of two years."

Debate continued.
Question—that the word "Collingwood," proposed to be omitted, stand part of the motion—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes, 7.     Noes, 2.
The Chairman,     Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Burton,     Mr. Craven.
Mr. Crean,     Mr. Harris.
Mr. Morey,     Mr. Melville.
Mr. Trenwith,     Mr. J. S. White.

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Debate continued on Mr. Trenwith's motion, viz.:—That the Committee recommend the construction of the Collingwood line.

Mr. Craven moved, as a further amendment, that the following words be added to the motion, viz.:—

"On condition that no railway shall be commenced until the municipalities interested, or any of them, shall give a satisfactory guarantee that the revenue to be derived from such railway shall be sufficient to pay the working expenses thereof, and also 4 per cent. per annum interest on the capital cost of such line, such guarantee to continue in force for five years."

Question—that the words proposed to be added be so added—put. The Committee divided.

Ayes, 4.     Noes, 5.
Mr. Burton,     The Chairman.
Mr. Craven,     Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. Harris,     Mr. Melville.
Mr. J. S. White.     Mr. Morey.
Mr. Trenwith.

And so it passed in the negative.

Mr. Melville moved, as a further amendment, that the following words be added to the motion, viz.:—"now, and that the Fitzroy line be constructed at the expiration of two years."

Question—that the words proposed to be added be so added—put. The Committee divided.

The Chairman,     Mr. Burton.
Mr. Buchanan,     Mr. Craven.
Mr. Harris,     Mr. Harris.
Mr. Morey,     Mr. J. S. White.
Mr. Trenwith.

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Question—that the Committee recommend the construction of the Collingwood line now, and that the Fitzroy line be constructed at the expiration of two years—put. The Committee divided.

The Chairman,     Mr. Burton.
Mr. Buchanan,     Mr. Craven.
Mr. Harris,     Mr. Harris.
Mr. Morey,     Mr. J. S. White.
Mr. Trenwith.

And so it was resolved in the affirmative.

Ordered—that a Draft Report be prepared and considered at the next meeting.

E. H. CAMERON,
Chairman.

Parliament House,
Melbourne, 23rd December, 1896.
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APPENDIX A.

VICTORIAN RAILWAYS.

RETURN showing the Approximate Loss on the Existing Lines beyond the Northern Suburbs for the year ending 30th June, 1896.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;North Melbourne to Coburg&quot;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>203,919</td>
<td>6,518</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8,566</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>5,882</td>
<td>6,243</td>
<td>14,447</td>
<td>5,901</td>
<td>8,157</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>119,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy to Whittlesea</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>246,828</td>
<td>4,137</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>745</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>6,369</td>
<td>2,203</td>
<td>8,925</td>
<td>8,096</td>
<td>14,224</td>
<td>7,855</td>
<td>9,873</td>
<td>24,097</td>
<td>1,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Park to Clifton Hill (including Fitzroy branch line) Collingwood to Heidelberg</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>231,179</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>1,071</td>
<td>3,071</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>7,369</td>
<td>2,807</td>
<td>9,247</td>
<td>16,616</td>
<td>1,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood to Heidelberg</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>189,054</td>
<td>4,233</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4,846</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>2,463</td>
<td>3,162</td>
<td>7,022</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>7,562</td>
<td>14,581</td>
<td>62,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield Park to Riversdale...</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>178,600</td>
<td>Closed for Traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 1/2</td>
<td>1,049,380</td>
<td>17,526</td>
<td>3,461</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>24,337</td>
<td>7,813</td>
<td>15,341</td>
<td>20,128</td>
<td>43,092</td>
<td>18,745</td>
<td>41,983</td>
<td>85,091</td>
<td>60,728</td>
<td>8,472</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The total revenue includes the mileage proportion of the traffic passing over the section North Melbourne to Royal Park Junction (24 miles) derived from the Whittlesea, Heidelberg, and Collingwood lines.

Accountant's Office,
3rd November, 1896.

(Signed) R. SINGLETOR,
Accountant.
APPENDIX B.

REPORT BY THE VICTORIAN RAILWAYS COMMISSIONER (Mr. Mathieson), BASED ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF TWO LINES TO THE NORTHERN SUBURBS.

I.

REPORT ON PROPOSED RAILWAY FROM PRINCE'S-BRIDGE TO COLLINGWOOD (DOUBLE LINE).

Length, 2 miles 6 chains; ruling grade, 1 in 94; sharpest curve, 20 chains radius.

Cost of Construction—

The Engineer-in-Chief estimates the cost of construction at £97,197 per mile, or a total of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£201,685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Cost—

Interest on capital expended at 3½ per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working Expenses—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locomotive expenses</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>£7,437</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic expenses</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>1,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent-way expenses</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total working expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£15,052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total annual cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£20,111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Revenue from Proposed Line—

From passengers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£20,771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total revenue from proposed line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£20,771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated revenue from carriage of foregoing traffic over existing railways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>Nil.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£20,771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net profit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revenue.

Explanatory Remarks—

Estimated of revenue is arrived at as follows—

Population of district, 37,023; reckoning 58 journeys per head of population at 1½d. (the average rate on Preston line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£15,422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parcels and cinders traffic to Clifton Hill and Collingwood, and vice versa, 350,000 passengers per annum. Assuming 66 per cent. of these will go on to terminus at 1½d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add 50 per cent. for increased traffic consequent on direct route and more frequent service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Foreign" bookings, 43 per cent. of "local" revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4,674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£20,771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditure.

Explanatory Remarks—

Rolling-stock is proposed to consist of—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 engines at £8,500</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>£42,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 carriages at £1,000</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£44,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This amount has not been included in the cost of construction estimated by the Engineer-in-Chief, as the stock would be used for other suburban traffic and could not, therefore, be properly charged exclusively to this line.

Permanent-way expenses will probably be increased after the first six years by 3½ per cent.

Traffic and items of expense are based on the assumption that Clifton Hill will be the terminus, making length of line 3 miles, and that the train service will be similar to that on the present St. Kilda line. The total annual train mileage run on this line will then be 136,425 miles.

(Sgd.) JNO. MATHIESON,
Victorian Railways Commissioner.
II.

REPORT ON PROPOSED RAILWAY FROM PRINCE'S BRIDGE TO NORTHOCHE VIA FITZROY (DOUBLE LINE).

Melbourne, 30th July, 1886.

Length, 2 miles 68 chains; ruling grade, 1 in 50; sharpest curve, 12½ chain radius.

Cost of Construction—
The Engineer-in-Chief estimates the cost of construction at £80,814 per mile, or a total of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£230,119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual Cost—
Interest on capital expended, at 3½ per cent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total annual cost</td>
<td>£28,825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working Expenses—
Locomotive expenses
Traffic expenses
Permanent-way expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total working expenses</td>
<td>£18,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Revenue from Proposed Line—
From passengers
Total revenue from proposed line

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>£18,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated revenue from carriage of foregoing traffic over existing railways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>£18,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated deficit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>£5,586</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVENUE.

Explanatory Remarks—
The estimate of revenue is arrived at as follows:

Population of district, 29,000. Reckoning 50 journeys per head of population at 1½d. (the average rate on Preston line)....... £9,063
Present bookings from Preston line and North Fitzroy and river cross, 51,361.
Assuming 20 per cent. of these travel further citywards at average of 1½d. each.
      Present traffic from Preston line to Flinders-street and North Melbourne transferred to new line, 386,500 at 1½d. each.
      Present traffic from North Fitzroy and River Cross to Flinders-street.... 3,666

Add 33 per cent. for increased traffic consequent on direct route and more frequent service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£18,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanatory Remarks—
Rolling-stock is proposed to consist of—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>£49,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This amount has not been included in the cost of construction estimated by the Engineer-in-Chief, as the stock would be used for other suburban traffic, and could not, therefore, properly be charged exclusively to the new line.

Permanent-way expenses will probably be increased after five years by 32½ per cent. Traffic and loco expenses are based on the assumption that Middle Northcote will be the terminus, making the length of line 4 miles, and that the service will be similar to that on the St. Kilda line at present. The total annual train mileage run on this line will thus be 181,994 miles.

(Sd.)
JNO. MATHIESON,
Vicotorian Railways Commissioner.
III.

SUMMARY COMPARING THE TWO LINES AS SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE BY THE RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

The tile of papers forwarded to the Committee by the Railway Department contains information respecting two lines to the Northern Suburbs, the routes of which are almost identical with those selected by the first Committee in 1894, viz.:

Prince's-bridge to Collingwood via Wellington Parade (double line with high level over Johnston-street).
Prince's-bridge to Fitzroy and Notteacon via Spring Gardens and Young-street (double line with high level over Heidelberg-road).

The following particulars are given respecting the two lines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collingwood Line</th>
<th>Fitzroy Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>2 miles 6 chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tearing grade</td>
<td>1 in 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpest curve</td>
<td>20 chains radius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost of land</td>
<td>£9,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost of permanent-way materials (75½% steel rails)</td>
<td>£3,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost of works</td>
<td>£108,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total estimated cost (exclusive of engines and rolling-stock)</td>
<td>£291,685*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on capital expended, at 4½ per cent.</td>
<td>£7,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual working expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locomotive expenses</td>
<td>£7,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic expenses</td>
<td>£4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent-way expenses</td>
<td>£771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total working expenses</td>
<td>£13,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total annual cost (interest and working expenses)</td>
<td>£20,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated revenue (all of which is to be derived from passengers)</td>
<td>£20,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net profit per annum</td>
<td>£660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit per annum</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated cost of rolling-stock not included in capital cost:
3 engines at £3,500 | £10,500 |
31 carriages at £1,000 | £31,000 |
Total | £48,500

The Department has not included the cost of rolling-stock in the capital cost of the lines, as it is stated that “the stock would be used for other suburban traffic, and could not, therefore, be properly charged exclusively to these lines.”

The figures given by the Department are based on the construction of two lines—the Heidelberg traffic being carried over the Collingwood line, and the Whitelaws and Preston traffic over the Fitzroy line. If only the Fitzroy line is built, a connexion would probably be found necessary to accommodate the Heidelberg traffic; while if only the Collingwood line were constructed, a connexion would be necessary to accommodate the traffic from the Preston and Whitelaws line.

If the two lines were made the cost would, according to the estimate now furnished, be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost (exclusive of engines and rolling-stock)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length to construct</td>
<td>4½ miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and compensation</td>
<td>£170,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent-way materials</td>
<td>£9,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of works</td>
<td>£22,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>£332,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note.—This is for a line on a high level at Johnston-street. A line crossing Johnston-street on the level would cost £14,112 less.

THOS. G. WATSON,
Clerk of Committees.
APPENDIX C.

REPORTS BY THE COMMISSIONER BASED ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF ONE LINE ONLY TO THE NORTHERN SUBURBS.

I.

ESTIMATES BASED ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF COLLINGWOOD LINE ONLY, WITH NECESSARY CONNEXION TO BRING IN THE PRESTON AND WHITTLESEA TRAFFIC.

Estimated Cost of Construction, Interest, and Working Expenses of the Direct Line from Prince’s-bridge to Collingwood, with a connexion from Clifton Hill to the Preston and Whittlesea line.

Line—Prince’s-bridge to Collingwood (1 in 24).
Length—2 miles 6 chains.
Cost per mile—£97,197.
Total cost—£261,385.
Interest per annum—£7,929.

Working Expenses.
Loco.—£7,457.
Traffic—£4,540.
Permanent way—£775.

Line—Clifton Hill to Norcesta (loop), (1 in 20).
Length—50 chains.
Cost per mile—£45,920.
Total cost—£28,470.
Interest per annum—£598.

Working Expenses.
Loco.—£2,590.
Traffic—£4,339.
Permanent way—£315.

Duplication of existing line, Collingwood to Clifton Hill—
Total cost—£7,050
Interest per annum—£245.

Grand Totals.
Total cost—£237,135.
Interest per annum—£8,302.
Working Expenses—
Loco.—£10,027.
Traffic—£9,170.
Permanent way—£1,990.
Total interest and working expenses—£23,789.
Total estimated revenue—£28,189.
Estimated loss per annum—£520.

The foregoing information was furnished to the Committee by the Hon. the Minister for Railways, with a memorandum from the Commissioner (Mr. Midleton) dated 15th September, 1896.

II.

ESTIMATES BASED ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF FITZROY LINE ONLY, WITH NECESSARY CONNEXION TO BRING IN THE HEIDELBERG TRAFFIC.

Estimated Cost of Construction, Interest, and Working Expenses of the Direct Line from Prince’s-bridge to Fitzroy, with a connexion from Norcesta to Fairfield Park.

Line—Prince’s-bridge to Fitzroy, 2 miles 65 chains.
Cost per mile—£86,311.
Total cost—£230,319.
Interest per annum—£8,061.
Working Expenses—
Loco.—£8,905.
Traffic—£6,070.
Permanent way—£292.
Line—Northcote to Fairfield Park (loop), 48 chains.
Cost per mile—£27,655.
Total cost—£167,713.
Interest per annum—£5,953.
Working Expenses—
Loco.—Nil extra.
Traffic—£25,900.
Permanent way—£105.

Interest—£8,646.
Working Expenses—
Loco.—£8,965.
Traffic—£29,970.
Permanent way—£1,025.
Total interest and working expenses—£28,416.
Total estimated revenue—£214,373.
Estimated loss per annum—£4,067.

The foregoing information was furnished to the Committee by the Hon. the Minister for Railways, with a memorandum from the Commissioner (Mr. Mathieson) dated 26th September, 1896.

APPENDIX D.

RETURN SHOWING POPULATION OF THE CITIES OF RICHMOND, SOUTH MELBOURNE, FITZROY, AND COLLINGWOOD; TRAM AND RAILWAY TRAFFIC FROM RICHMOND AND SOUTH MELBOURNE; ESTIMATED LOCAL RAILWAY TRAFFIC FROM FITZROY AND COLLINGWOOD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Present Population</th>
<th>Average Journeys per Head of Population</th>
<th>Total Journeys per Head of Population who will Pay Toll and Tram</th>
<th>Estimated No. per Head of Population who will Pay Toll by Rail</th>
<th>Annual Traffic</th>
<th>Rail</th>
<th>Tram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richmond (including East Richmond and Burley)</td>
<td>35,226</td>
<td>67 s. d. 48</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>s. d.</td>
<td>£21,925</td>
<td>2,194,429,154,150,000</td>
<td>4,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Melbourne (including Albert Park)</td>
<td>35,112</td>
<td>48 s. d. 57</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>s. d.</td>
<td>10,534</td>
<td>1,004,223,2,066,830</td>
<td>5,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>9,963</td>
<td>1,456,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood</td>
<td>30,545</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>92 (19)</td>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Ward, Melbourne</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>92 (19)</td>
<td>18,422</td>
<td>2,110,425,5,760,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ward, Richn.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average No. of rail journeys per head of population is and from Melbourne, Albert Park, South Melbourne, Richmond, East Richmond, and Burley.

Traffic Manager's Office,
Spencer-street Station, 24th April, 1896.

(Signed) J. F. PEARCE,
Deputy Outdoor Superintendent.

*The loss, expressed with this memorandum, would not be increased beyond the amount estimated for the Fitzroy Direct line terminating at Middle Northcote on present estimates, viz., £4,067.
APPENDIX E.

DESCRIPTION FURNISHED BY THE ENGINEER-IN-CHIEF OF THE FITZROY LINE AS SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE.

Engineer-in-Chief's Office, Spencer-street, Melbourne, 4th September, 1896.

PROPOSED RAILWAY.

Princes' bridge, via Fitzroy, to Northcote.

Balling grade, 1 in 50; sharpest curve, 12½ chains radius.

This line, which is designed as a double line throughout, commences at a point near the junction of Flinders-street and Wellington Parade in the Prince's bridge station yard, and, passing in a north-easterly direction under Wellington Parade and through the Treasury Gardens, assumes a northerly course after crossing Launcestown-street and entering Fitzroy Gardens. Running along the western boundary of these gardens for a short distance the line enters a tunnel, opposite Grey-street, passing under Launcestown, Albert, Victoria, Little Victoria, Little Napier, and Gertrude streets, and then emerges from the tunnel and changes to high level, which continues past the back of Fitzroy Town Hall to the Fitzroy station.

This high-level line crosses over Condliff, Moor, St. David, Groves, Johnston, Angle, Kerr, Rose, Leicesters, Westgarth, Coold, and Reilly streets. Alexandra and Queen's Parades, on iron girder bridges with brick abutments, in every case spanning the full width of the streets named. Between Condliff and Moor streets the line is put on brick and concrete arches to minimize interference with the Town Hall buildings; at Fitzroy station the line descends to the natural surface, and then runs parallel for 18 chains with the existing Fitzroy branch line (which it is proposed to leave as it is for goods traffic, as far as Scotchmer-street), where it diverges to the east by a long curve 13 chains radius to the junction, with the Whittleson railway, about 7 chains from the south end of the railway bridge across the Merri Creek; on this line level point Ivan, Bennett, and Park streets are crossed on the street levels and double gates have been provided for these, same as an existing Fitzroy cackspur.

Arrangements at Prince's bridge Station.

In accordance with the general plan for the rearrangement of the above station prepared in 1890, it was decided that both the Fitzroy and the Collingwood lines should be brought into the present Cambewall dock at the Prince's bridge station. The recent proposal of a central station at Flinders-street will, therefore, materially affect these two proposed lines. The question whether or how they can be brought into the central station is under the consideration of the Commissioner.

The cost of removing the engine shed, coal stages, and other structures at present occupying the ground over which these two proposed lines must be taken into the Prince's bridge station (or central station) is not provided for in the Engineer-in-Chief's estimate, as their removal and re-creation was to form part of the general plan for ameliorating Prince's bridge station. The same remark applies to any alteration or addition to existing platform accommodation at Prince's bridge station, but the Engineer-in-Chief's estimate includes the following works within the station area:

1. Additional signals and interlocking
2. Earthworks at the commencement of the line
3. Continuation of existing well along south side of Flinders-street to near corner of Wellington Parade
4. Quarter-circle of double line of way to carry the line into the station

Stations.

Three stations beside Fitzroy station are proposed, the first in the Fitzroy Gardens alongside of Lansdowne-street, opposite the North College, being situated in a deep cutting. The second station has been placed at the north end of the tunnel between Gertrude and Webb streets, and is also in a cutting. The third station is situated between Groves and Johnston streets, and is on the high level. At Fitzroy station the passenger lines will have to be at high level, to exit bridge over Queen's Parade. The goods accommodation can be connected to the available area on the west side of station, the approach being by Napier and Freeman streets.

All the stations are designed with two platforms, each 400 feet long, with the necessary approaches, so as to meet the requirements of the travelling public. A provision of 21,000 pro station has been made in the estimate for station buildings, &c.

Tunnel.

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 arc, 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 1/16 acres in a strip parallel to existing paths, and from the Fitzroy Gardens about 1/16 acres. A 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 approach is made upon Lansdowne-street, 60 links wide by 11 chains long, as the remaining width of that street, 66 feet, is considered ample for the present or future traffic in the locality.
Lengths of Various Works.

The total length in open cutting is about 25 chains; in cutting covered by road bridges, about 11 chains; in tunnel, 880 linear yards, or about 31 chains; on high level, about 76 chains, of which about 21 chains are on bridges and arches, and about 55 chains on embankments with ornamental retaining walls. About 22 chains of the line from Fitzroy to junction with Whitehorse line is on the surface. Wolfe-street is crossed on the street level, which is unavoidable. The crossing of the Royal Park to Clifton Hill railway is on the level, and provision has been made in the estimate to secure this crossing by interlocked signals.

APPENDIX F.

DESCRIPTION FURNISHED BY THE ENGINEER-IN-CHIEF OF THE COLLINGWOOD LINE AS SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE.

Engineer-in-Chief's Office, Melbourne, 4th September, 1896.

PROPOSED RAILWAY.

Prince's-bridge to Collingwood.

Rolling grade, 1 in 94; sharpest curve, 20 chains radius.

As in the case of the Fitzroy railway, this railway, which is designed as a double line throughout, starts near the corner of Flinders-street and Wellington Parade, and, passing in an easterly direction under the southern part of the parade, turns into the plantation situated in the centre of Wellington Parade, of which it takes away about one-half of the width. Opposite Lansdowne-street a subway for foot passengers is provided, and the crossing over Jolimont-road is by a girder bridge; the line entering the cutting a few chains further on, passes under Johnson Terrace Crescent into the Yarra Park, which it skirts to its north-eastern corner. Here the proposed line enters the tunnel, passing under Wellington Parade, Ruddle and Cross streets, gradually assuming a northerly course by a 20-chain curve, and, within a short distance of the north end of the tunnel, becomes a high-level line as far as Collingwood station, crossing on the way Egan, York, Garfield, Elizabeth, Victoria, Greenwood, Bloombury, Langridge, Gipps, Vere, Yarra, Studley, Stafford, and Johnston streets on iron girder bridges, spanning in every case the whole width of the streets.

Between Victoria and Greenwood streets, also between Bloombury and Langridge streets, and between Langridge and Gipps streets, the line is put on brick and concrete viaducts to avoid interference with property.

The line terminates at Collingwood station, which will have to be modified, and provision is made for this work in the Engineer-in-Chief's estimate.

Prince's-bridge Station.

The general remarks made in connection with the Fitzroy line apply also to the Collingwood line, except that the works within the Prince's-bridge station yard, provided for in the estimate, are as follows:

1. Earthenworks at the commencement of the line.
2. Additional signals and interlocking.
3. Quarter mile of double line of way to carry the line into the station.

Stations.

Three stations besides the Collingwood station are proposed, the first being in the Yarra Park, alongside the Wellington Parade, opposite the Melbourne Cricket Ground in a cutting; the second station is placed between Cross and Egan streets, girding on the northern end of the tunnel, and is partly in cutting, partly in back. The third is a high-level station, situated between Elizabeth and Victoria streets.

Collingwood passenger station will have to be raised, but the goods yard there will remain on the low level.

All these stations are designed to have two platforms, each 400 feet long, with the necessary station buildings, &c. £1,900 per station has been provided in the estimate for these buildings.

Tunnel.

The tunnel situated between Wellington Parade and Cross-street is to be 409 yards long, arched with brick or concrete. It will be constructed on the "cut and cover" principle, and be lit with electric light.

Public Gardens.

The area required from the plantation in Wellington Parade for the purposes of this railway is about 4½ acres; that required from Yarra Park about 3½ acres, the line through the latter being in a deep cutting.

Lengths of Various Works.

The line will be in open cutting for a distance of about 48 chains, of which road bridges will extend over about 5 chains—in tunnel for 429 linear yards, or about 13 chains, and on the high level for about 1 mile 21 chains, of which about 32 chains are on bridges and arches, and the remainder on embankments, with retaining walls in various places.
APPENDIX G.

REPORT BY THE ENGINEER-IN-CHIEF ON QUESTION OF RAILWAYS TO NORTHERN SUBURBS.

Engineer-in-Chief's Office, Railway Department, Melbourne, 17th May, 1895.

Memo for the Honorable the Minister of Railways.

In accordance with the provision of the Railways Standing Committee's Act I have the honour to apply the following report or proposed railways to the Northern Suburbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Line</th>
<th>Length—Mils.</th>
<th>Steepest Grade</th>
<th>Steepest Curve—Chns. Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge, Exit Fitzroy, to</td>
<td>2:85</td>
<td>1 in 50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northe suite, &amp;c.</td>
<td>2:07</td>
<td>1 in 62</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost of Construction.**

The cost of construction for a double line of way throughout, and based on present low rates, is estimated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Line</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Cost per Mil.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land and compensation</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent-way materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge, Exit Fitzroy, to</td>
<td>£80,625</td>
<td>210,990</td>
<td>73,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northe suite, &amp;c.</td>
<td>4,755</td>
<td>24,590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge to Collingwood, &amp;c.</td>
<td>87,630</td>
<td>175,090</td>
<td>84,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with level crossings at John-</td>
<td>8,751</td>
<td>207,771</td>
<td>78,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ston-street, &amp;c.</td>
<td>82,181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost of scheme recommended</td>
<td>106,878</td>
<td>385,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by Standing Committee</td>
<td>8,751</td>
<td>207,771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add— if line be raised over John-</td>
<td>1,914</td>
<td>9,616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ston-street</td>
<td>9,616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost for scheme free of level</td>
<td>170,397</td>
<td>217,387</td>
<td>80,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crossings</td>
<td>8,751</td>
<td>207,771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See later estimate increased to £426,004.*

These estimates do not include the cost of the rolling-stock.

**ANNUAL COST.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest on capital cost, at 5½ per cent.</td>
<td>£15,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working expenses—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locomotive and carriage expenses, 24 per cent. of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimated revenue</td>
<td>£12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic expenses and general charges, 36 per</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cent. of estimated revenue</td>
<td>18,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent-way expenses, 1 per cent. of estimated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenue</td>
<td>2,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total working expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total annual cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Revenue from Proposed Lines</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From passengers</td>
<td>£41,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From goods and miscellaneous</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue from proposed lines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated revenue from carriage of forgoing</td>
<td>£31,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic over existing railways</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not estimated)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£31,666
REMARKS.

ROLLING-STOCK.—The value of the rolling-stock required to work these two proposed lines is estimated at £23,000. The Department has sufficient rolling-stock on hand to work these two lines at present.

POPULATION.—The population to be served by the proposed lines is estimated at 80,000 souls.

REVENUE.—The estimate of revenue expected from the two proposed lines is based on the gross revenue earned on the South Suburban railways during the year 1895. The population served by these lines is about 140,000 souls, and the number of passengers per head of population is 1.25. Taking only 100 passengers per head of population in the district to be served by the two proposed lines, we should have 8,000,000, and averaging these at 1½d. per head (it was 2d. on South Suburban lines in 1895), the revenue for passengers would be £4,166. Allowing goods and miscellaneous traffic to bring in £10,000, the total income would be £31,000, or £48,000 more than the estimated annual cost. As this allows nothing at all for development that would be caused by the construction of these lines, the prospects of being able to pay, even paying lines, are very promising indeed.

HISTORY OF THE LINES.—The two proposed lines were included in the 1889 Railway Bill, and were referred to the Railways Standing Committee, who, on the 21st October, 1891, recommended both for construction.

The Committee’s estimate is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Line</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost (£)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince’s-bridge, via Fitzroy, to Northcote, Young-street (double line)</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>£316,729*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince’s-bridge to Collingwood, via Wellington-parade (double line)</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>£294,411*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Exclusive of land and compensation, but inclusive of rolling-stock.

When recommending the construction of the lines the Committee passed a resolution, which was embodied in their Report, and which is to the effect “that the districts interested shall guarantee the interest on the cost of the land taken for railway purposes and compensation for damage until such time as the railways shall pay working expenses and interest on the cost of construction.” See Second General Report, page 3, and also pages xvi and xvi of the Report on the proposed railways to the Northern Suburbs.

RIVAL ROUTES.—In order to reduce the outlay, a great number of schemes have been brought forward at various times. Two out of this number were carefully gone into, and the estimate is given in the following table:

FITZROY LINE WITH LOOP FROM COLLINGWOOD STATION ALONG REILLY-STREET.
Fitzy line, as given above...... 2.36       £210,000
Loop line along Reilly-street, high level, with connection towards Clifton Hill and Collingwood station, double line of way...... 1.24       107,610
Total...... 4.09       £317,610

FITZROY LINE WITH LOOP FROM COLLINGWOOD STATION, SOUTH OF JOHNSON-STREET.
Fitzy line, as above...... 2.82       £210,000
Loop south of Johnstone-street, high level, double line of way...... 0.92       101,150
Total...... 3.74       £311,150

In my opinion neither of these schemes would suffice for the ultimate requirements, and both the Fitzroy and Collingwood lines will be necessary.

A map showing the proposed lines to Fitzroy and Collingwood, also the estimates showing the particulars required, are attached.

F. RENNICK, Engineer-in-Chief.
### APPENDIX H.

#### EXISTING TRAMWAY SERVICE

**MEMO. OF LENGTHS OF ROUTES AND TIME OCCUPIED IN COVERING SAME (INCLUDING STOPPAGES).**

- **Johnston-street Line (Corlton).**
  - Length from terminus to Prince’s-bridge: 3 miles 34 chains.
  - Time taken to cover this distance: 26 minutes 20 seconds.
  - Time from Johnston and Hoddle streets to Bourke-street: 19 minutes.

- **Smith-street Line (Clifton Hill).**
  - Length from terminus to Post Office: 3 miles 16 chains.
  - Time taken to cover this distance: 29 minutes.
  - Time from corner of Johnston and Smith streets to Post Office: 17 minutes.

- **Victoria-street Line.**
  - Length from terminus to Town Hall: 2 miles 74 chains.
  - Time taken to cover this distance: 18 minutes 30 seconds.
  - Time from corner of Hoddle and Victoria streets to Town Hall: 11 minutes.

- **Brunswick-street Line ( Fitzroy).**
  - Length from terminus to Town Hall: 3 miles.
  - Time taken to cover this distance: 20 minutes.
  - Time from corner of Johnston and Brunswick streets to Town Hall: 10 minutes 30 seconds.

- **Nicholson-street Line.**
  - Length from terminus to Post Office: 2 miles 30 chains.
  - Time taken to cover this distance: 20 minutes.
  - Time from corner of Johnston and Nicholson streets to Post Office: 13 minutes.

- **South Melbourne.**
  - Length from terminus to Elizabeth-street: 2 miles 68 chains.
  - Time taken to cover this distance: 51 minutes.

- **For: Melbourne Line.**
  - Length from terminus to Elizabeth-street: 2 miles 62 chains.
  - Time taken to cover this distance: 19 minutes.

- **Brunswick Line.**
  - Length from terminus to Hobson’s Bay Railway Station: 4 miles 35 chains 61 links.
  - Time taken to cover this distance: 29 minutes.
  - Time taken from Sarah Sands Hotel, Brunswick-road, to Hobson’s Bay Railway Station: 19 minutes.

- **St. Kilda Line.**
  - Length from terminus to Town Hall: 3 miles 18 chains.
  - Time taken to cover this distance: 27 minutes 30 seconds.
  - Time from Wellington-street to Town Hall: 19 minutes.

- **Prahran Line.**
  - Length from terminus to Town Hall: 4 miles 69 chains.
  - Time taken to cover this distance: 35 minutes.
  - Time taken from Commercial-road to Town Hall: 24 minutes 30 seconds.
  - Time from South Yarra Railway Station to Town Hall: 19 minutes.

- **Toorak Line.**
  - Length from terminus to Town Hall: 4 miles 35 chains.
  - Time taken to cover this distance: 20 minutes 30 seconds.
  - Time from Chapel-street junction to Town Hall: 20 minutes.
HEADWAY, IN MINUTES, ON FIVE NORTHERN LINES, AT VARIOUS TIMES OF THE DAY, AND ON SOUTH AND PORT MELBOURNE AND BENDIGO LINES.

Note.—The headway is more or less irregular and long in early a.m. 10 minutes, 9 minutes, 8 minutes, etc., until 7.30 or 8 o'clock, then each line is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Johnstone-street, after 7.30 a.m.</th>
<th>Smithfield-street, after 7.30 a.m.</th>
<th>Viewtown-street, after 8 a.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td>To 8 a.m.</td>
<td>4 20</td>
<td>To 8 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 p.m.</td>
<td>6 0</td>
<td>9.35 a.m.</td>
<td>3 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 p.m.</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>11 a.m.</td>
<td>4 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 p.m.</td>
<td>4 80</td>
<td>1.30 p.m.</td>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30 p.m.</td>
<td>3 26</td>
<td>1 p.m.</td>
<td>3 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30 p.m.</td>
<td>4 90</td>
<td>6 a.m.</td>
<td>3 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.30 p.m.</td>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 p.m.</td>
<td>3 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last ear at night</td>
<td>5 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Brunswick-street, after 8 a.m.</th>
<th>Nicholas-street, after 7.30 a.m.</th>
<th>South Melbourne, after 7.30 a.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30 a.m.</td>
<td>6 26</td>
<td>8.30 a.m.</td>
<td>7 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 p.m.</td>
<td>5 48</td>
<td>1 p.m.</td>
<td>6 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30 p.m.</td>
<td>5 16</td>
<td>4 p.m.</td>
<td>5 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 p.m.</td>
<td>6 25</td>
<td>5.30 p.m.</td>
<td>5 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last ear at night</td>
<td>7 15</td>
<td>6.30 p.m.</td>
<td>5 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.30 p.m.</td>
<td>4 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last ear at night</td>
<td>7 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last ear at night</td>
<td>6 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Port Melbourne, after 8 a.m.</th>
<th>Brunswick, after 7.30 a.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30 a.m.</td>
<td>9 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30 p.m.</td>
<td>7 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30 p.m.</td>
<td>6 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last ear at night</td>
<td>9 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last ear at night</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX 1.

REPORT BY THE ENGINEER-IN-CHIEF ON MR. MILLANE'S NORTHERN SUBURBS RAILWAY SCHEME.

Memo.

Mr. Millane's Proposed Railway for the Northern Suburbs from Spencer-street, via Lansdale-street, etc., to Fitzroy and Collingwood.

1. The little of Spencer-street station-yard breadth shows that this line could not junction either towards the north or the south, with the existing lines at Spencer-street station-ya, without a large destruction of railway property and conveniences, sheds, platforms, roads, ties of way, etc., and a re-arrangement at enormous cost of the station works, which could not be justified except as a matter of dire necessity.

The works, the alterations, and their cost, involved within the yard would have to be determined by the Railways Commissioners assuming he was in the first place disposed to entertain this railway scheme as a work of usefulness or necessity.

2. Considering the projected line for passengers only terminating at Spencer-street, it may be briefly described as follows:—

The line would leave an underground station at Spencer-street by a cut and cover, and tunnel on, say, the north side of the terrace along Lansdale-street, sheathing in the open between Queen-street and Elizabeth-street, and thence by a cutting and bank with retaining walls, completely blocking the wired traffic for 7½ chains on the north side of Lansdale-street, opposite valuable business properties. Thence it would proceed via a viaduct over Elizabeth-street, Swanston-street, Russell-street, and Exhibition-street, dipping under and blocking the north side of Lansdale-street near Spring-street for about 10 chains; thence by a bridge under Spring-street turning into a cutting on the site of the Model Schools; thence by a bridge under Victoria-street into a cutting on the south side of Exhibition-ground; thence crossing over Cameron-street and under and down the course of Nicholas-street; thence alongside the tram lines in that street to Ray-street; thence overhead through private property into Reilly-street, and by Reilly-street and Meadville-road into the Fitzroy station; thence by the proposed Government route to the Northcote and Preston line. From the Model Schools it is proposed to construct a branch line to Collingwood, crossing under Evelyn-street, through private property, into and under Simpson-road, Victoria-pasture; thence down the centre of this pasture, by cut and cover, tunnel, embankment, and cuttings, to Simpson-street; thence serving through private property overhead into and along the centre of Roddell-street to Johnstone-street; thence through private property into the Collingwood station.

The total length of the main line from Spencer-street through Fitzroy station to the junction with the Preston line would be 4 miles 42 chains, of which there would be cut and cover or tunnel 34½ chains, viaduct, bridges, and arches 1 mile 30½ chains, cuttings and embankments 1 mile 4½ chains.

The total length of the Collingwood branch would be 1 mile 50 chains, of which there would be cut and cover or tunnel 18 chains, viaduct and bridge 60½ chains, cuttings and embankments 7½ chains.

NORTHERN SUBURBS.
Stations are proposed on the main line at Spencer-street, between Elizabeth and Swanston streets, in Lonsdale-street, at the Melb. Schools, at the north side of Carlton Gardens, near Riley-street, and, as at present, at Fitzroy.

And on the branch line to Collingwood at the Melb. Schools, in Victoria-parade, near Smith-street, near the corner of Victoria-parade and Hobson-street, and, as at present, at Collingwood.

One of these stations would be underground, three in open cuttings, four on embankments, and one on a viaduct.

My estimate of the cost of these lines as projected by Mr. Millane, exclusive of the works and alterations involved in a connexion with the Spencer-street station-yard, are as stated in the schedule attached hereto; or for the main line to Fitzroy and the Preston line, £397,518, and for the Collingwood branch, £190,967. These estimates are based on the same rates and same standard of construction as those for the Government scheme to serve Fitzroy and Collingwood already before the Committee.

I am of opinion that under the present condition of the city, its population, its business, and necessities, this railway project cannot be justified. The cost of any workable connexion with the lines in Spencer-street yard, and of the consequent modification necessitated in re-arranging that yard, would be a very serious item. On this point the opinion of the Railway Commissioners should be obtained.

I have not included any money which might have to be laid to property holders or others for damage to the streets, or frontages, through the construction of this railway.

F. RENNICK, Engineer-in-Chief.

APPROXIMATE COST

Of Mr. Millane's street railway from Spencer-street along Lonsdale-street, Nicholson-street, Heidelberg-road, to Fitzroy station, and joining Whittlesea railway near the Merri Creek, with stations at Spencer-street, between Elizabeth and Swanston streets, Model School, Exhibition Gardens, Alexandra-parade, and Fitzroy.

Double line of way.

Length, 3 miles 32 chains. Rolling grade, 1 in 50. Sharpest curve, 12 chains.

Land and compensation ... ... ... ... ... £32,920
Fencing ... ... ... ... ... ... 900
Level crossings in North Fitzroy ... ... ... ... 316
Earth works ... ... ... ... ... ... 25,518
Cut and cover and tunnel ... ... ... ... 50,976
Viaducts, bridges, arches, retaining walls ... ... 173,846
Culverts and drainage, cutting sewers ... ... 1,885
Metalling roads ... ... ... ... ... ... 413
Railway ... ... ... ... ... ... 4,180
Sleepers ... ... ... ... ... ... 2,985
Rails and fastenings, points and crossings, laying ... ... 5,770
Station accommodation ... ... ... ... 13,618
Interlocking and signals ... ... ... ... 3,680
Telegraph ... ... ... ... ... ... 600

£345,067

5 per cent. provision ... ... ... ... ... 34,657
5 per cent. engineering, surveying, supervision ... ... 17,294

Total cost of scheme ... ... ... ... £397,518

APPROXIMATE COST

Of Mr. Millane's scheme for the Collingwood branch from Model School along Victoria-parade and Hoddle-street to Collingwood station, with stations at Model School, South-street, Simpson-street, and Collingwood.

Double line of way.

Length, 1 mile 70 chains. Rolling grade, 1 in 50. Sharpest curve, 12 chains.

Land and compensation ... ... ... ... ... £18,780
Level crossing ... ... ... ... ... ... 115
Earth works ... ... ... ... ... ... 10,253
Cut and cover tunnel ... ... ... ... ... 22,800
Viaducts, bridges, retaining walls ... ... 94,071
Drainage and cutting sewers ... ... ... 1,462
Metalling roads ... ... ... ... ... ... 275
Railway ... ... ... ... ... ... 2,447
Sleepers ... ... ... ... ... ... 1,710
Rails and fastenings, points and crossings, laying ... ... 4,316
Station accommodation ... ... ... ... 3,195
Interlocking and signals ... ... ... ... 2,525
Telegraph ... ... ... ... ... ... 300

£166,049

10 per cent. provision ... ... ... ... ... 16,605
5 per cent. engineering, surveying, supervision ... ... 8,300

Total cost of Collingwood branch ... ... ... £190,957
Total cost of Fitzroy scheme ... ... ... £397,518

Approximate cost of complete scheme proposed by Mr. Millane ... £588,475
SUMMARY OF APPENDIX K.

1. SUMMARY OF PRÉCIS OF REPORT OF FIRST COMMITTEE ON PROPOSED RAILWAYS TO THE NORTHERN SUBURBS.

1. Scheme Referred to Committee—
   (a) Cost of land, permanent way, and works.
   (b) Cost of engines and rolling-stock.
   (c) Route for Fitzroy line.
   (d) Route for Collingwood line.
   (e) Objections to 1890 proposals.

2. Schemes Investigated—
   (a) Street railways.
   (b) Mr. Milner's street railway scheme.
   (c) Cable railways or trams.
   (d) One line only.
   (e) Mr. Groves's scheme—one route with four lines of way to Peel street; branches thence to join Fitzroy and Collingwood spurs.
   (f) Mr. Buchanen's scheme.
   (g) Mr. Finsen's "cut and cover" scheme.

3. Scheme Adopted by First Committee—
   A. Fitzroy line—
      (a) Route selected.
      (b) Stations provided.
      (c) Tunnels.
      (d) Interference with gardens.

   B. Collingwood line—
      (a) Route selected.
      (b) Stations provided.
      (c) Tunnel.

   C. Heidelberg line to Northcote loop line rejected.
   D. Cost of scheme adopted by first Committee.
   E. Districts interested to guarantee interest on cost of land.
   F. Working expenses and prospective revenue.

APPENDIX K.

1. PRÉCIS OF REPORT OF FIRST COMMITTEE (REPORT No. 3 OF 1891).

1. SCHEME REFERRED TO COMMITTEE.

The lines to the Northern Suburbs, as designed and estimated by the Railway Department, and originally proposed to the first Committee in 1890, were as follows—

(a) Cost of Land, Permanent-way Material, and Works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Line</th>
<th>Cost of Land</th>
<th>Permanent-way Material</th>
<th>Total Estimated Cost, Including of Permanent-way Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge station to Collingwood station</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>234,444</td>
<td>360,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge station to Scotchmer-street, Fitzroy</td>
<td>90,783</td>
<td>205,842</td>
<td>306,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotchmer-street to Northcote</td>
<td>15,967</td>
<td>60,510</td>
<td>76,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg line to Northcote (loop line)</td>
<td>28,917</td>
<td>20,846</td>
<td>49,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>391,880</strong></td>
<td><strong>419,862</strong></td>
<td><strong>811,742</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Mile: 339,464
The estimated expenditure of £911,151 did not include the cost of engines and rolling-stock. The Department estimated in 1890 that a sum of £129,988 would be required to equip the proposed lines with the necessary rolling-stock.

(c) Route for Fitzroy Line—Prince's Bridge to Northcote.

The route proposed by the Railway Department for the line to Fitzroy started at Prince’s Bridge station and, running parallel with Flinders-street, entered a tunnel 29 chains in length at the foot of Spring-street. It passed under Spring Gardens, Lansdowne-street, the Fitzroy Gardens, Victoria Parade, and the southern portion of Flinders Street between George and Nepier streets, leaving the tunnel at Charles-street. It was then carried on a viaduct to Scotchman-street, North Fitzroy, so as not to interfere with the traffic of the various thoroughfares from Johnson-street to Heidelberg-road inclusive. Only one intermediate station, at Johnson-street, was provided in this scheme. The line was continued from Scotchman-street in a north-westerly direction so as to reach the Northcote station by the shortest possible route, passed through a number of properties, and over the Clifton Hill and Royal Park railway on a viaduct (in order to prevent the possibility of a collision with trains running on that railway), and, continuing on a viaduct, crossed the Merri Creek, and came down to the level of the Whittlesea railway at the Northcote station.

(d) Route for Collingwood Line.

The railway to Collingwood, proposed by the Railway Department, started at Prince’s Bridge station, ran parallel with the Richmond line as far as Jolimont-road, where it entered a tunnel 42 chains in length, and, passing under Yarra Park between Jolimont and the Melbourne Cricket Ground, and also under Wellington Parade and Hoddle-street, left the tunnel near Euston-street, Richmond. From this point to Gipps-street Collingwood, the railway proceeded on a viaduct a few chains to the east of Hoddle-street, crossing over Garfield, Elizabeth, Victoria, Langridge, and Gipps streets, and, coming down to the surface at Vere-street, it crossed Johnson-street on a level with the railway, and joined the existing branch line at the Collingwood station. Only two intermediate stations were provided on this railway, one being near the Melbourne Cricket Ground, at the mouth of the tunnel, and the other at Victoria-street.

(e) Objections to 1890 Proposals.

The objections to the departmental scheme of 1890 were mainly—(1st) The largeness of the proposed outlay. (2nd) The length of the tunnels. It was thought that the discomfort of travelling underground for nearly a mile on the Fitzroy line, and nearly half a mile on the Collingwood line, would greatly diminish the passenger traffic. The Fitzroy line passed under the most thickly populated portion of the municipality, and there being no station till Johnson-street was reached, half the district was traversed without the possibility of gaining a passenger. The tunnels were further objected to because of the cost and difficulty of lighting either the tunnels or the trains, the necessity for keeping the tunnels properly ventilated, and the necessity for burning a special fuel to keep the tunnels as free as possible from smoke.

2. SCHEMES INVESTIGATED.

The principal objects kept in view by the Committee during the inquiry were—
1. The reduction of the large outlay proposed by the Department;
2. The shortening of the length of tunnel on both lines without disfiguring the Fitzroy Gardens or Yarra Park, and without necessitating the piling up of expensive properties avoided by the tunnels.

They investigated several schemes, the most important of which were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. STREET RAILWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pitched 20 foot in width, with bluestone pitches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitched with redgum blocks resting on concrete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the surface of the street were followed, there was a grade of 1 in 18 for 20 chains in Lansdowne street, and it was found that locomotives of a special type would be required to haul trains up that grade, and mechanical contrivances to check them in their descent into Prince’s bridge station.

An estimate was then prepared for an elevated section at Prince’s bridge, the line to be carried on an iron and steel viaduct through the station yard over Wellington Parade and along Lansdowne-street, reaching the level of that railway near the Scotch College. The elevation of the line resulted in a grade of 1 in 30, and the cost was increased to:

| Bluestone pitches | ... | ... | ... | £140,017 |
| Redgum blocks resting on concrete | ... | ... | £156,274 |

The advantages claimed for a street railway were principally—
(1st) That such a railway could be built with cheapness and rapidity.
(2nd) That the line would be a tentative means for developing traffic, and for testing the accuracy of the statements regarding the probable traffic on a line to Fitzroy.

The results obtained on the steam tramways of Sydney were urged in favour of the street railway to Fitzroy, and examples of street railways in Adelaide and the United States were pointed to.
The Department strongly objected to the proposal, and hoped that the "responsibility of such a railway would not be placed on their shoulders." The principal reasons urged against the plan were:

1st. The danger arising from the steepness of the grade leading into Prince's-bridge station.
2nd. The crossing on the level of Victoria Parade, Gardiner-street, and Johnson-street—three busy thoroughfares along which trains run at short intervals.
3rd. The danger to vehicular traffic in Napier-street, there being only 18 feet between the sides of the carriages and the crown of the street.
4th. The width of the spaces required for the changes of the engine-wheel, etc. to run in.
5th. The slow rate of speed advisable owing to the necessity of keeping the train well under control.
6th. The depreciation of property in the streets traversed.
7th. The cost of running, which was stated to be excessive.

The fact that it had been found necessary to do away with the street railway in Finsbury-street and to build a costly viaduct was referred to.

The proposal for a street railway to Fitzroy was rejected by the Committee by eight votes to five.

---

**Mr. Millane's Street Railway Scheme.**

Another street railway scheme, submitted by Mr. P. W. Millane, of the Lands Department, was investigated. He proposed to bring the Collingwood line on a viaduct from its present terminus along Hobbs-street and Victoria Parade to the model schools for the deaf, and then to extend the combined line, partly on viaduct and partly in trenches, along Swanston-street to Swanston-street station, in addition to other stations which he proposed at the model schools and between Swanston-street and Elizabeth-street in Little-street.

Mr. Millane estimated his scheme would cost £225,000.

The advantages claimed for it were its cheapness, and the fact that passengers would be deposited in the centre of the city instead of at Prince's-bridge station.

No provision was made for compensating owners of property along the streets traversed, and no one came forward to support the project but the engineer who assisted to prepare Mr. Millane's plans.

---

**Cable Railways or Tramways.**

Estimates were prepared for cable railways or tramways by Mr. G. S. Dunn, Chief Engineer of the Melbourne Tramways Trust, and by Messrs. Norman and Woodroffe of the Railway Department.

These estimates were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge to Fitzroy station, along Landseers and Napier streets</td>
<td>2 1/2 miles</td>
<td>£784,466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince's-bridge station to Collingwood station, along Wellington Parade and Hobbs-street</td>
<td>2 1/2 miles</td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Dunn's estimates included the cost of rolling-stock for a three-quarter-hour service, and the cost of engine-house, machinery, &c. He stated that the trains could be run at a speed of 12 miles an hour without stoppages, which would admit of the trip from Fitzroy to Prince's-bridge being done in eleven minutes, against nine minutes by train, including stoppages, and thirteen minutes from Collingwood against eleven minutes by railway.

The annual cost of working the services was estimated by Mr. Dunn as follows:

- **Fitzroy**
  - £21,121
  - £7,439

- **Collingwood**
  - £25,440
  - £15,007

Messrs. Woodroffe and Norman estimated the working expenses per day as follows:

- **Fitzroy**
  - £65

- **Collingwood**
  - 75

or £257,725 and £27,375 per annum respectively.

The principal objections to the cable railways were:

1st. That they would be tantamount to a break of gauge, as the railway rolling-stock could not run on the connections.

2nd. That they could not compete successfully with the existing trains which traverse the busiest street of Collingwood and Fitzroy and land their passengers in the heart of the city, whereas the connecting trains would have to deposit passengers at Prince's-bridge station.

3rd. That they would not do away with the claims of the Northeast suburbs to a substantial railway with the accompanying cheap rates and rapid transit.

The proposal for cable tramways to Fitzroy and Collingwood was rejected by six votes to five.

---

**D.—One Line Only.**

The Committee made careful inquiries if one line of railway, through either Fitzroy or Collingwood, Fitzroy only, could be made to serve the Northern suburbs, and came to the conclusion that "nothing would practically be saved by making only one connection." It was found that the Heidelberg trains could be brought into Fitzroy over the proposed loop line, branching off the Heidelberg railway near Fairfield station, and joining the Whitehorse line at the Norwood station. This loop line was estimated to cost £48,000, but it was stated that it would eventually have to be made for departmental reasons in order to complete the
Outer Circle railway, but that there was no immediate necessity for it, and that if both the direct Finsbury and Collingwood line, were made it could remain unconstructed for the present. If only the Finsbury connection were made the Collingwood branch line would be left in its present almost useless condition, and it would not be likely to lead to any improvement in the value of the Yarmouth and King's Lynn line, which Parliament has authorized the Government to sell.

On the other hand, if the Collingwood direct line alone were made it would be necessary to construct a loop line from Northallerton station across the Great Circle to the Milton Hill station, as an estimated cost of 200,000l., in order to bring the Whitbourne and Preston traffic to Preston Station. That line would be of little or no service if the direct Finsbury line were carried into the city at any time hereafter. The concentration of the Whitbourne, Preston, and Heidelberg traffic at Clifton Hill station would also necessitate the expenditure of a railway between that point of junction and the Collingwood station, at an additional cost of 250,000l., and more than likely, in the near future, an elevated station at Collingwood, with an overhead crossing at Johnstreet-street, would have to be made, at an estimated cost of 350,000l., consequent on the large number of trains that would daily cross that busy thoroughfare. In any case, the bringing of only one or two proposed connections into the city would necessarily involve an additional station at once on a loop line and works which would very well be postponed for some years or deferred altogether if both lines were made, and the money so saved utilized towards making the connection which, it might have been thought, could be dispensed with for the present.

The entire cost of the Collingwood direct line alone being constructed the Finsbury branch line could be extended eastward down Reilly-street to the Collingwood station. That extension would be a costly one, as a number of streets would have to be crossed on a high level, and it is not likely that any of the inhabitants of North Finsbury would allow themselves of a railway following that route, insomuch as they would be taken 60 shares towards the cost at the beginning of their journey only to be carried the same distance westward near the termination of the trip. In other words, the distance between the Finsbury station and Prince's bridge by the direct route is 5 miles, but by way of Reilly-street Collingwood and Yarmouth it would be 3 miles, and if the line were occupied in making the longer trip, but as the suburban fares are based on the mileage travelled it would cost 4d. to reach the city by that route, as against 3d. by train.

Premises come to the conclusion that there were two distinct districts, each being thinly populated, to be served by the proposed connections, and as the railway mileage at the back of the Finsbury extension was about 9 miles, while there were the Heidelberg, Outer Circle, and the proposed New Asylum Reserve lines at the back of the Collingwood railway, two pairs of rails could not for any length of time carry all the traffic expected from those districts. The cost of having four pairs of rails would necessarily be great, as additional property would have to be acquired, and another tunnel constructed to carry the extra lines. Mr. Speight stated, while under examination—

"Assuming for the moment that it is necessary to make both lines, it is put down that the Collingwood and that new now Northern line, as far as a point, east, towards Camberwell, and if this further scheme through the Yarmouth estate is made it would also serve that line, and as the Yarmouth railway joins the Camberwell Outer Circle railway, it would give an alternative route to the one from Fairfield Park. In that case, Collingwood, in addition to the local traffic, would have to accommodate the services of trains, one from Heidelberg and the other from Camberwell and Southend station. The Finsbury would have to accommodate two services of trains, one from the Whitbourne and the other from the Royal Park line, and, as I have said before, the people required to be taken into Melbourne at the same time. Two services of trains upon each pair of rails would very soon be as much as those railways could do. It has been suggested that one route should be made to serve both, but if you were to do that you would not give the same amount of local accommodation to the districts lying between the new proposed route and Prince's bridge stations. I should think you would not be able to effectively compete for that traffic. If you make the concentration of lines it would cost nearly as much as to make the two separate lines, because where you came to the point of concentration you would require four lines of railway, and the necessary additional expense consequent on that and the increased revenue of their concentration practically at the mouth of a tunnel on entering the station. Seeing that you do not care anything in concentration, and seeing you afford more local accommodation by the construction of the two lines from the standpoint of the return on the amount invested, I should say it would be a wise thing to deal with them both in the same way, and certainly the longer you delay dealing with those lines the more costly will be the land you will require for the purpose of serving them hereafter."
in evidence that he considered the two connections were worth at least £150,000 more than the rate suggested by Mr. Green. That was to say that the gagging of the line being embargoed by keeping the proposed lines as far apart as possible, an additional traffic would be obtained which, for all time, would pay the interest on that sum. The scheme for two lines was finally adopted by the Committee and estimated to cost only £13,021 more than Mr. Green's scheme, which was rejected by twelve votes to one.

F.—Mr. Buchanan's Scheme.

Mr. Buchanan, M.I.C., a member of the Committee, submitted the following scheme for the Fitzroy line:

Starting at Prince's Bridge station, passing through the East Melbourne Cricket Ground and over Wellington Parade on a bridge, then through the centre of the Fitzroy Gardens (on an embankment in the southern portion) and a cut-off at the northern end to Albert-street, where there was a station to serve the southern part of Fitzroy. From Victoria-street to Moorabool-street, a distance of half-a-mile, the railway ran in a tunnel under the centre of George-street. At Moorabool-street another station was provided, and the line joined the departmental road at St. David-street, and was carried thence to the Fitzroy station on a high level. Steepest gradient, 1 in 60.

The advantages of this route were the easier gradients—1 in 60 against 1 in 50, and the comparative cheapness; the cost being estimated at £257,270.

The objections to it were that no provision was made for compensating property-owners in George-street, where the line ran under the road; that the East Melbourne Cricket Ground, which is vested in the Commonwealth, would be covered in such a manner as to render it less useful for station-ward purposes; that the Fitzroy Gardens would be interfered with more than by any other proposal; and that it would have half-a-mile of tunnel. The scheme was put aside in favour of the route ultimately chosen.

G.—Mr. Fraser's "Cut and Cover" Scheme.

Mr. James H. Fraser, C.E., of the Railway Department, submitted a scheme which he had designed for a railway to Fitzroy on the "cut and cover" plan. He proposed to carry the line through Spring and Fitzroy Gardens in an embankment, and thence in a covered way or tunnel under the surface of George-street for a mile and a quarter to near the Fitzroy station. The tunnel was to be made by an excavation in the street, resting on arches placed on the roadway. The estimated cost by Mr. Fraser was £194,555. No provision was made for compensating the owners of property standing on the street.

The chief merit of the scheme was its cheapness. The objections were the length of tunnel; the obstruction to traffic in George-street by having 20 ventilation openings in 3½ streets; the fact that compensation would have to be paid to owners of property along George-street.

3. Scheme Adopted.

Two lines, the routes for which were suggested by the Chairman of the Committee (The Hon. T. Best, M.L.A.), were finally adopted by 17 votes to 1.

A.—Fitzroy Line.

(c) Route Selected.—Prince's Bridge to Northcote.

The line to Fitzroy started at Prince's Bridge station, and ran parallel with Flinders-street to the foot of Spring-street, passed under Wellington Parade; then in a shallow cutting through Spring Gardens and under Landwehr-street into the Fitzroy Gardens. The railway entered a tunnel in the gardens before reaching Grey-street, and passed under Landwehr-street, Victoria Parade, and Gertrude-street, came out of the tunnel at the north side of Gertrude-street. The tunnel was 38 chains in length, but a large opening for most of its length and 20 feet wide was to be made in the course of it in Victoria Parade for ventilation and lighting purposes, thus dividing the tunnel into two lengths of about 18 chains each. The line, on leaving Gertrude-street, crossed Webb-street on the surface, passed Little Charles-street by an embankment, which was necessary to enable the line to attain sufficient height to clear all the streets from there to the Heidelberg-end on bridges. The cost of the Fitzroy spur was then followed to Northcote, where the line entered the junction of Whittlesea and Clifton Hill streets, where it took the level of the existing line passing through Northcote.

(b) Stations Provided.

Three stations were provided. One opposite Gipps-street, in the Fitzroy Gardens, of which about a chain in width was taken; another at Gertrude-street, in the centre of the most densely populated part of Fitzroy, close to the large thoroughfares of Gertrude, Brunswick, and Sturt streets, and within easy reach of Nicholson-street and the Exhibition Building, and a third between Greens- and Johnson-street. This station was elevated. The two additional stations provided added greatly to the utility of the line.

(c) Tunnels.

The length of tunnel was reduced from 1 mile to 20 chains, in two lengths of 15 chains each. It was thought that these two comparatively short lengths could be worked without special lighting provision, and without special provision for ventilation other than that afforded by the large opening in Victoria Parade.

(d) Interchange with Gardens.

It was thought that the shallow cutting in the Spring Gardens would not detract from the beauty of the reserve. The Fitzroy Gardens were only encroached on to the extent of 1 chain in width and 7 chains in length. The ghettos had to be encroached on to get into the tunnel.
B.—COLLINGWOOD LINE.

(a) Route Selected.

The line to Collingwood starts at Prince's Bridge station, and, running parallel with Flinders-street, passed through the centre of the plantations in Wellington Parade, crossing over Johnson-road on a bridge, and thence in a shallow cut through the northern end of Yarra Park, keeping close to the fence. At the intersection of Simpson-street and Wellington Parade the railway enters a tunnel 15 chains in length, and, leaving it on the east side of Hoddle-street, near Ermington, Richmond, followed the course of the original proposal to Collingwood on the east side of Hoddle-street. That is from Ermington to Gipps-street on a viaduct a few chains to the east of Hoddle-street crossing over Garfield, Eliza, Melbourne, Granville, and Gipps streets, and, crossing down to the surface at Vere-street, crossing Johnson-street on the level and joining the existing spur at Collingwood station. The length of this line was 2,29 miles, or nearly 7 chains shorter than that referred to the Committee.

(b) Stations Provided.

Three stations were provided, one near Clarendon-street, one near Highett-street, and one near Victoria-street, as against two on the departmental scheme.

(c) Tunnel.

The length of tunnel was reduced from half-a-mile to 15 chains.

C.—UNDERCOVE LINE TO NORTHCOVE LOW LINE REJECED.

The bulk of the land required for this line is stated to have been secured by the Railway Department in 1885. The Department stated that the loop would eventually have to be made for departmental reasons in order to complete the Outer Circle Railway. The Committee decided that there was no present necessity for it if both the Fitzroy and Collingwood lines were made. The estimated cost of the loop was £49,963.

D.—COST OF SCHEME ADOPTED BY FIRST COMMITTEE.

The total cost of carrying out the Committee's recommendations, compared with the scheme submitted for inquiry, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Scheme</th>
<th>Committee's Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length (Miles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delisted from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortest in Length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length (Miles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delisted from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortest in Length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost (£)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Or a reduction of £22,9,948 on the original estimate.

E.—DISTRICTS INTERESTED TO GUARANTEE INTEREST ON COST OF LAND.

It is recommended that the Committee express the opinion that, whenever as they have proposed that local bodies should be called upon to find the necessary land for country railways, the districts interested in the construction of the lines to the Northern Suburbs ought to be made to guarantee the interest on the cost of the land taken for railway purposes and compensation for damage, until such time as the railway shall pay working expenses and interest of the cost of construction.

F.—WORKING EXPENSES AND PROSPECTIVE REVENUE.

The annual cost of working the two lines is not given in the first Committee's Report; but is the probable revenue estimated. The reasons given for their recommendations may be summarized as follows:

1. The large outlay already incurred in making the lines beyond Fitzroy and Collingwood, which are of comparatively small utility at present and which would be developed by the extensions. A sum of £1,180,000 having already been spent on railways with which the Collingwood and Fitzroy direct lines will connect.

2. The densely populated districts traversed by both lines. The Government Statist estimated that at the end of 1899 the population of the Northern Suburbs would be 121,000.

3. The results obtained on the south suburban railways, which likewise have to contend against tram competition.

4. The belief that "there was every prospect of the railways becoming remunerative undertakings in the near future."

Thos. G. Watson,

Clerk of Committees.

1st September, 1899.
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MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

FITZROY AND COLLINGWOOD LINES.

TUESDAY, 29th SEPTEMBER, 1896.

Members present: Mr. Cameron, in the Chair; Mr. Burton, Mr. Craven, Mr. Harris, Mr. J. S. White.

Francis Reamick sworn and examined.

1. By Mr. Cameron. What are you?—Engineer-in-Chief of the Victorian Railways.

2. I presume you are acquainted with the whole district through which the several lines are proposed to be made?—Yes, I have a general knowledge of it.

3. Do you propose, as the best scheme, that the two lines should be constructed?—Yes, I think so, to serve the population.

4. You estimate the cost of the line is £432,000 for the two?—I have not put them together, but it is £281,085 for the Collingwood, and £290,319 for the Fitzroy.

5. What area do you think would supply the two lines, speaking now about the boundary within which they would be needed? How far west would people go to either line?—There is a map contained in the papers which you have compiled by me, or under my instructions, showing the gathering grounds for the two lines together I have not made a separation, and it is coloured on the map. This is the map I refer to—pointing to a map.

6. By Mr. Burton. The green means what?—The green means the suburbia lines.

7. By Mr. Cameron. What is the most westerly point to which you go?—Nicholson-street, it is, running past the Exhibition, and when you get up to Carlton you go over to, suppose, Lygon-street, and up to Brunswick.

8. The nearest line would be in which street from North Fitzroy to Melbourne?—It follows Young-street.

9. Do you think people would come from Lygon-street to Young-street?—They would go to North Carlton station, and North Fitzroy, and then by the Fitzroy line into the city.

10. How far north do you think they would use the line?—Down to Jellis敦.

11. That is within two or three hundred yards of the Prince's-bridge station?—Yes. There would be a station at the Fitzroy Gardens, and that would take passengers from Grey-street, the Scotch College, and in that neighbourhood.

12. Would they go from the street running east and west at the back of this reserve, would they go down to the Fitzroy Gardens station and into the railway so to go to Prince's-bridge?—From about the Government offices?

13. Yes. They might. I think most people would walk from there, but there is a very small population anywhere in the neighborhood of Parliament House; it is mostly reserves.

14. In carrying this line on, you would continue from the Fitzroy station, which is close to the Heidelberg-road, as it is called that is what they call the Fitzroy Northern Station line?—The Fitzroy line starts at Prince's bridge station, and goes to the line near Northcote. It goes right through the Fitzroy station, and parallels with the present Fitzroy spur, and joins the Whittlesea line above Southcote-

15. Would it necessitate the relaying of that line?—It is prepared to lay a double line alongside the present line.

16. Do you mean one line besides the one there now?—No. That is provided for in the estimate. The present line would be used for the goods traffic coming to the Fitzroy station from Spencer-

17. The Fitzroy spur would not be utilized for this purpose then?—No.

18. You would require then to start from, as I say, north of Southcote-street, and make a new line all the way to Prince's-bridge?—Yes; and lift the lines and platforms at present in the Fitzroy station to the high level.

19. In the event of there not being more than one line recommended, would this be the best line?—The Fitzroy line.

20. Yes. I do not think so; I prefer the Collingwood line.

21. Will you just show the Committee why you prefer the Collingwood line?—Fitzroy is better served by a tram service than Collingwood; that is, Collingwood needs a railway more than Fitzroy does, in my opinion; and I think, too, that it would probably pay better.

22. Do you know the difference in the population of the two places?—No; as I explained, I did not separate the population; but I should think that you might divide it by 2, and say that 40,000 would be served by the Fitzroy, and 40,000 by the Collingwood.

Northcote Surface.
25. By Mr. Harris.—Thus you think because of the larger tram service of Fizroy, that is why you prefer the Collingwood route?—Yes.
26. By the Chairman.—How many people would avail themselves of the Collingwood line would go, if that line were not constructed, to the Fitzroy line?—That I could not tell; but I should think they would travel to the Fitzroy line from an easterly direction for three-quarters of a mile; practically, from where the Collingwood line is located on the plan.
27. By Mr. Merton.—From Hobbie-street?—Yes, that is, the northern portion of the population would travel over three-quarters of a mile to Fitzroy; but it would depend greatly on the fares by tram or rail.
28. By Mr. J. S. White.—And what portion of the country they wanted to go to?—Yes.
29. By the Chairman.—In the event of the Fizroy route being recommenced, and the Collingwood, what would you do with the Clifton Hill to Collingwood present line?—I have not considered that; but if Collingwood and Heidelberg are to continue to have interchange of traffic, you would keep it open.
30. If you were to make the loop line from Northcote South to join the Preston and Whittlesea line, do you think there would be still work for it unless you connected the Collingwood station with the Fitzroy line? Collingwood would object to give up its railway, because they get traffic from the other Victorian lines, and they have the goods traffic, firewood and other stuff, there. A railway manager might propose to close it, but he would have any amount of opposition.
31. By Mr. Harris.—What other goods traffic is there?—Firewood from the northeast and other traffic.
32. By the Chairman.—Do you think the connection you propose to make of a loop line from the Heidelberg branch and Whittlesea line is a better connection than the Reilly-street loop that is marked here on the plan?—Yes, decidedly. I do not believe in the Reilly-street connexion at all.
33. We would like to know your reason for that?—Because the other is so much cheaper, and because also, it brings the Heidelberg traffic more directly into the city.
34. If the line was made at Reilly-street, would that not take all the people about Clifton Hill?—Yes.
35. Whereas the other loop from South Northcote would not?—No, it would not, but I would prefer it instead of making the Reilly-street loop from Collingwood station. A better loop than this would be to make the line west from Hoddle-street.
36. Is looking at it from an £. s. d. point of view, that would be much more expensive than the one west from the Collingwood line to the Fitzroy line up Reilly-street?—Very little more.
37. Would you not go through more houses on the Johnston-street line than in Reilly-street?—Yes, there might be more properties to purchase, but not many more. The estimate shows to connect Clifton Hill along Reilly-street with Fitzroy and a loop from Collingwood station would cost £118,662. The other, the alternative one, which I would prefer, north of Johnston-street, would cost £117,668; practically the costs are equal.
38. Then either of those loops would be worth from Collingwood to Fitzroy, and not from Fitzroy to Collingwood?—Yes, Collingwood to Fitzroy.
39. Would you not advise either of those lines from Fitzroy?—No, certainly not.
40. You would not advise either of those lines from Fitzroy?—No, certainly not.
41. You would advise any of those loops from Clifton Hill?—Yes.
42. Would you advise the route across Mount Creek, branching off from Preston?—Yes, the Whittlesea line; that is if the Collingwood line were to be made only, a loop across the Mount Creek from the Whittlesea line.
43. What is the length of the tunnel or covered cutting on the Fitzroy line?—I think you have got it there in a schedule. It would be a little less than half-a-mile perhaps.
44. Would that be a tunnel or a covered cutting?—On the Fitzroy line it would be a tunnel.
45. Would either line be on a high level, say between half-way between Gertrude-street and Johnston-street, on to where the present station is at Fitzroy?—All on the high level.
46. What height?—About 1ft. 6in. or 1ft. 3 in above the streets.
47. To enable the street traffic to go underneath?—Yes.
48. What would be the length of that, approximately?—I cannot tell you that, but you have it somewhere on the papers.
49. How far out do you propose to go with the double line?—Which one?
50. Where is there a double line now on the road to Preston?—Yes, not double to Preston. I think it exists at Middle Northcote, I am not sure; and the Fitzroy line would be a double line all through until it intersects that.
51. Right through to Prince's bridge?—Yes.
52. With reference to the Collingwood line, I see you follow the Richmond-road, as we call it?—Washington-parade.
53. Till you pass Hobbie-street?—Yes.
54. And you run on some couple of claims I suppose east of that street, parallel with it?—Yes.
55. Would it be possible to follow the street itself, that is, Hobbie-street?—It would be quite possible, but I think all the frontagers would object.
56. You would have the most of that on the high level?—No, it goes under Hobbie-street in a covered way; it is beneath the street.
57. Does it run on the low level all up the street till you reach the Collingwood station?—No, it emerges from the covered way at Hippsley-street, where there would be a station. It goes into the open there, and from that it would be a low-level line all the way to Collingwood.
58. Would you have to raise the present Collingwood station higher than it is now?—Yes.
59. How far towards Clifton Hill do you propose going on the high level?—I would go to just beyond the present station, and then follow the line at the present station to Clifton Hill.
60. You know there is a very steep grade at Clifton Hill?—It is 1 in 50.
61. Would it cost very much more to continue it on the higher level until you reached that point, and thus save the grade?—It would cost considerably more, and I do not see that it would be any advantage.
58. What is the use of regarding the steep grades then, as you are doing in places?—For suburban traffic, that is to say, in flat country. Moreover, the steep grades on the old Geelong line (that is where the 1 in 40 grades are), there would be no use in altering the 1 in 40 at Clifton Hill unless you followed it up, and unfortunately the traffic was likely to require that for 50 years to come.

59. Supposing the Collingwood line were constructed, and not the Flinders line, you have then a way of connecting up lines all the Preston line, down to a point more than half-way to the present route with a bridge over the Merri Creek at Clifton Hill?—Yes.

60. Is it not possible to cross the creek on the present Preston line, and then curve round to join the route on the west side of the Merri Creek?—The curve would be too sharp.

61. On this plan it would seem feasible enough?—Yes. It presented itself to me much the same, but I have had it looked into, and I find it would involve too sharp a curve.

62. What would be the radius of the curve?—It would require a 5 or 6 chain curve to connect, to use the same bridge.

63. You had no actual survey made, I suppose, to determine that?—Yes, we have the whole thing plotted on a large plan.

64. We had Mr. Kearsney out there, and he thought it would be possible to have it made with a curve of 1 in 17. We have a large plan in the office on which the whole thing can be tried at any time. It has been tried, and it cannot be done without involving a sharp curve.

65. It would save a bridge if it could be done?—Yes, and £10,000 would be about the cost of the bridge and the approach.

66. You think it would not be practicable?—No, not for such a line as we propose to construct, and such a line as this is likely to develop into.

67. What length of tunnel would you have on the Collingwood line?—It would be a covered way; perhaps close on a quarter of a mile. It would be a cutting from the surface graded over and covered up.

68. That is much cheaper than a tunnel, is it not?—Much cheaper.

69. It would not make it any more convenient for those using the line?—No, it would be dark, the same as a tunnel. We could, of course, light it through the roof at intervals, but that would be to destroy the property, to some extent.

70. What the Committee would like to know is, in the event of only one line being constructed, how much of the traffic that would go to the other line, if the two were constructed, would go to this one?—I would suggest that you examine Mr. Matheson on that point, because he is a traffic man, and I am not. I have given my views as regards the people who would travel over the Flinders line.

71. I would not have asked the question were it not that in your estimate you put down the revenue as well as the cost of construction. Of course, I stick to the estimate. At that time I had an object in doing that, and it was my duty at the time. If you like, I will consider the matter, and give you my opinion on it. If either of those lines were constructed and not the other, the people would travel from half to three-quarters of a mile to a station to get a cheap fare into the city—periodical travellers, that is.

72. I suppose you know another proposal was thought of, in the event of the two lines not being feasible, that a centre line should be made; do you approve of that?—No; that was Mr. Groves's line, I think. I know there were several proposals.

73. Why do you not approve of that?—It would appear to involve that one line midway between the two might get more of the traffic of both than would go to one alone?—It would not serve the population so well, either to the west or to the east, as the two lines; and it would not be very greatly cheaper than the two lines, and in the future, then a glut of traffic took place (that is when the city grows to a million or so), the rails would not carry the traffic into the city.

74. You have your explanation then on the fact that the population would increase enormously?—I hope the population of Melbourne will grow in the future the same as in some of the other large cities of the world. It has developed in the past, and I do not see why it should not grow until it reached a million or two.

75. If you were asked to accommodate the people, and did not see your way to make two lines, you would give either one or the other rather than putting one line in the centre?—Yes, I would build one first, and hope that the other would be built as some future time.

76. By Mr. Harris.—As you say, a middle line would not serve the population as well as if the two lines were constructed, would it not be better than only constructing one of the two?—I do not think so.

77. You think the benefits it be derived it only one were to be constructed would not be greater with the centre line, with one of the others?—My opinion is if one line is constructed now the construction of the other must speedily follow to serve the population.

78. By the Chairman.—By the Collingwood line following down the Wellington-parade, do you think there is much gain, or is there a saving in the construction rather than to take an angle from the end of the Treasury Gardens to the centre of Hoddle-street and Victoria-street?—Yes, I think there is a great saving; the property you have to buy on the diagonal route would be very expensive.

79. You would go under them?—That would mean a longer tunnel, and that is objectionable in itself; besides, it would be very costly. Moreover, the present route accommodates the Melbourne Cricket Ground, gives a station near Hoddle-street, at Highett-street, and would pick up a lot of traffic at both places. That diagonal route was one of the alternative schemes considered by the first Standing Committee of Council, perhaps, a score of others, and rejected on its merits.

80. I may say that until we went over this route some three weeks ago I was under the impression it went in a sort of angle-wise all along. I did not know it went on the Wellington-parade down south to Hoddle-street all at. There is no doubt there would be a great traffic to the cricket ground occasionally?—Yes.

81. These plans and lines have been before you for the last five or six years, have they not?—Yes, for five years.

82. No doubt during that time you have been studying the best route to be adopted?—I gave a good deal of attention in 1891 and 1892 to the proposals, and arrived at my conclusions then. I have given more attention to the matter since, and I adhere to my convictions formed at that time.
83. Had you anything to do with them prior to 1891?—No. The first estimate I had nothing whatever to do with; the estimate the Committee adopted I prepared.

84. That is the first Committee, in 1851?—The estimate that was submitted to them I had nothing to do with the estimate they adopted, after the inquiry, I prepared.

85. Did you prepare it yourself?—That is, was it done under your supervision?—Yes.

86. How much was it below the first estimate?—I do not remember, but some hundreds of thousands of pounds, I think. I think it was something about £500,000 less; I am not sure of the amount, but I know it was somewhere hundreds of thousands of pounds.

87. You have reduced your estimates since 1891?—Yes.

88. On what grounds?—Prices of labour and materials have fallen since then materially, and of property too.

89. By Mr. Harris.—Are those the only reasons that induced you to reduce the estimates?—I do not know of any other.

90. By Mr. J. S. White.—The fall has been more particularly in property, has it not?—Of course there has been no modification in the work. I was going to say that my estimate was based on a different construction and different routes, which would partly account for the difference.

91. By the Chairman.—When did you make out this estimate?—During this year.

92. By Mr. Harris.—In view of the new estimate, would you be prepared to prepare another you could not make such alteration?—No.

93. By the Chairman.—In your opinion, what is the increase in prices?—I think there is a tendency that way.

94. In labour any higher?—Labour is going up a little, and materials have gone up a little.

95. Are you sure you can maintain your present estimate?—The revised estimate I have submitted to you is on the basis that the lines will be made within the next two years. Of course every estimate is more or less imaginary.

96. You do not know of any other scheme that would be cheaper, and serve the people as well?—I do not. I think these two lines should be made, for they have just as good a chance of non-normative traffic as the south suburban lines have.

97. By Mr. J. S. White.—On the same fares?—On fares that would compete with the tram.

98. On the same fares as on the south suburban?—Whatever fares the manager liked to put on.

99. By the Chairman.—Have you made any estimate or calculation on what would come in beyond the suburban?—Say, taking a 4 miles from Prince's Bridge, have you any idea what extra traffic you would get from the country beyond?—From Whittlesea and Heidelberg?

100. Yes!—I estimated that in the papers; I have allowed for that in my estimate of revenue.

101. Have you made a separate calculation, or is it gjossework?—On a given estimate. For instance, the basis of my computation of revenue was 80,000 people, each one travelling 100 times in the year; that would be 8,000,000, at so much a journey; and I added to that the outgoing traffic that would come from Heidelberg and Whittlesea, and all the lines that would join the suburban railways. That is how I arrived at the revenue.

102. Have you arrived at the number of tons of goods that are carried from the suburban districts into the city?—No.

103. You have not calculated on one single ton?—I did not calculate on that basis. I allowed so many thousand tons, but the chief traffic I would be the suburban traffic.

104. You do not know the number of tons that come in from the country up Whittlesea way?—I looked at it in a general way, considered the matter, and put down a sum.

105. That would be for the in and out traffic?—Yes, that is the proportion of that traffic which I consider would travel over those two lines.

106. You do not know the number of tons that come into Melbourne from that district?—I did not reckon the road traffic, but if the lines were made it would develop the railway traffic.

107. By Mr. Crean.—Would it not rob the line where it comes in at present to Spencer-street?—I do not think so.

108. Does it come in now?—Mostly by cart.

109. By the Chairman.—There is not a ton less than 60,000 tons which comes past Heidelberg and not one ounce of that comes by train?—No.

110. Then the question is, if they had better accommodation, how much of it would come by rail, or would any of it—If the Heidelberg line were extended, and these two lines were made it might develop that traffic.

111. By Mr. Harris.—If they have to cart to Heidelberg they might as well cart right to Melbourne?—I would not offer an opinion as to that.

112. By the Chairman.—The contention is that those near Melbourne with fruit, say, would not send it by rail, because of the trampishment; but I find that two-thirds of the fruit from the Plenty Valley comes by train, and the average distance is only 18 miles?—Yes. As to the possibilities of the suburban traffic, I took the trouble to ascertain the suburban railway traffic and the tramway traffic. The railways last year carried 30,000,000 passengers—that is the suburban—and the tramways nearly the same, or 54,000,000; or, together, 79,000,000 of suburban passengers. If you take that in a population of 400,000 and I do not think more than 400,000 of the metropolitan population is accommodated with trams and railways, it would give 175 passengers per head of population served.

113. By Mr. Harris.—In order to get these 30,000,000 and 34,000,000, what was the number of miles travelled by the railways as against the trams?—Our statistics do not give it, but I should think it would be about from 3 to 4 miles for the railways; the trams would not be more than 2 miles. That is only a rough estimate; that is my opinion.

114. About double the distance of the railways to the tramways?—Yes, because a lot of that railway traffic goes 20 miles from the city, and some 10 miles. In Sydney the statistics show the average, and it is about 3 miles; here, I think, it would be about 4 miles.

115. By the Chairman.—There is another scheme that has been submitted to us, what they call the Milne scheme; do you know anything about it?—Yes, I have seen it amongst the others; but that is a line to go up Lonsdale-street.
116. Yes, into the Model School, and then turn on to Nicholson-street to the head of Reilly-street, and then across to what they call the Heidelberg-road to the end of North Fitzroy; then there is another line that would start from the Model School, on Victoria-street or Victoria-park, down to Holland-street, and then on Holland-street to the Collingwood station?—Yes.

117. This proposition of Millane's proposes to accommodate 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?—No, only I know it was proposed in the years long ago, and that also was rejected on its merits. That project was also before the first Stabling Committee.

118. By Mr. Barton.—Have you ever gone into it at all?—Not into the details, but I would reject it on the face of it, because it would not give the accommodation that the other lines would or anything like it.

119. Would it not be an accommodation to people to be dropped down at the Model School or in Lansdale-street or Elizabeth-street?—The people who wanted to go to those places, but not to those who want to go to Colling-street or Flanders-street.

120. Who are the people who come to Flanders-street?—Nearly all the suburban traffic comes to Prince's-bridge and Flanders-street now.

121. Would they not divide and go to the different parts of the town if they were put down in Lansdale-street?—Yes, but not so many want to go there.

122. By the Chairman.—This would accommodate the north-western portion of the city better than the other; it would go a good distance into Carlton?—Yes, but it would not accommodate the population of the districts where these two lines are located to the same extent. As to Lygon-street, I do not know what they would say—they have a tramway there already. It would be like the orchard lines of New York, where they are found to be a nuisance.

123. By Mr. Creame.—Would not a station at the Model Schools be an advantage to the people at the end of the city?—Yes. The route would serve a lot of people; but as an alternative to these lines I do not think it is in the running at all.

124. Mr. Millane says he can construct either of those two for less than the others because there is no land to be purchased?—I could not say as to that.

125. Has not a lot of your land to be purchased?—Yes.

126. What would be the difference?—Mines would be cheaper, because his would obstruct the street if on brick arches; and it would have to be on light pilar, with a steel superstructure.

127. By the Chairman.—The only difference is, in Nicholson-street only a small portion has a great traffic, down from Carlton Gardens. Down to Reilly-street, and along Victoria-street, there is plenty of room?—That is a 3-chain street.

128. From Victoria-street to Johnston-street on Holland-street would be the worst?—Yes. You would find a good deal about that proposal of Mr. Millane's in the records of the other Stabling Committee.

129. You see the country is so different now to what it was 5 years ago, that what might have been acceptable then might not be acceptable now?—Just so.

130. By Mr. Creame.—As to the traffic to the cricket ground, how is it they have not already made a station near Richmond line near there?—There are six lines of way together there, and they are just as close as they can be. To work it, if you had a station there, you would have some difficulty in arranging it. The people would have to go in on one line and out on another.

131. Would they not be near to the actual centre of the cricket ground than on the present proposed route?—Yes. It could be done, and the waste is it has not been done before.

132. By the Chairman.—By means of a separate line?—Yes; but you must take people by all the present lines, and there would be a great difficulty in doing it.

133. Unless they went to Melbourne and came back?—That would not answer. The people would have to change at Richmond, and get into the trains that went to the cricket ground, and then they would have to change again. You would bring them in on the up Brighton, and take them out on the down Hawthorn line.

134. By Mr. Harris.—Do not people have to do that now; have they not to change at Richmond for some lines?—Yes.

135. By Mr. Creame.—If there were a station put there for the passengers on the present lines, would they not have to come to Prince's-bridge before they could start for other suburbs?—Yes.

136. Would they not have to change to get into other trains?—Yes. The cricket ground station in this proposal would be only for north suburban passengers.

137. Not for the people from other suburbs?—No, they would jump into a train to go to the cricket ground.

138. By Mr. J. S. White.—You say you look at the probability of its paying when you are going to make a line?—Yes.

139. You say you calculated the traffic was coming from Lygon-street?—Yes, at North Carlton. That is the street that passes on the east side of the cemetery.

140. You are aware they would have to cross the tram at Rathdown-street and also at Nicholson-street to get to your station?—Yes; they could go to North Fitzroy.

141. Do you think they would cross the Rathdown-street tram into Lygon-street and Nicholson-street tram that goes into the centre of the city? Do you think the people would walk down for that train instead of taking one of those trains?—Yes, for cheap fares.

142. You speak for yourself?—I would take a periodical ticket, and save 50 cent. of the tram fare.

143. Is not time the essence of the contract always?—Yes, and you would go at 20 miles an hour by rail and 6 miles an hour by the tram.

144. If you had to come down Bourke-street, coming to the Post Office, you would get to it almost as quickly by walking as if you walked across to the rail?—I do not think so. I have to scale the plan to say for every one that 50 per cent. of the daily travelling public, those who actually travel into and out of the city, would take a periodical ticket by rail in preference to taking the nearer tram.
146. They would cross those streets)—Bathhouse, Lyon, Nicholson, and Brunswick streets, and right down past Gerard-street to get into a station at John-street—? Any person within a quarter of a mile of these stations, and North Park, would have those stations and travel by rail.

147. You have calculated that the traffic from those places must travel on the line to make it pay?—I have calculated.

148. From Nicholson-street to Lyceum-street must be a passenger line to make it a paying line?—I have not the names of the streets here, but I have tried it on this plan as the past, which would feed the railway.

149. You reckon Lyceum-street as a feeder for your railway?—Yes. I do not say you would get every individual, but you would get a fair proportion of the population in that area if you ran the trains to suit them.

150. How often would you have them?—It depends on the traffic. On the Camberwell line they have a ten-minutes service, and St. Rika about the same. On the Brighton line they run every five minutes at certain portions of the day. I am only going by the time-tables.

151. How if the trains ran every three or four minutes, and your trains every quarter of an hour, could you compete?—People with limited means will be guided by their pockets.

152. Would the trains come down in their faces to compete with you?—Yes; the traffic will be divided between the two, and eventually, when my city comes to command a million or so, or long before that, there will be any proportion of traffic for both the railways and the trains.

153. You reckon on 50,000 people?—Yes.

154. Where did you pick that up?—That is taken from the statistics—the population statistics of 1891. I think, practically, the city population is about the same now.

155. Have not a great many left the place?—Not the city. The metropolitan population has not decreased much during the last eighteen months; before that time it did. Since that in some of the suburbs there has been an increase.

156. There are about 1,000 a week leaving our shores?—Yes, they are leaving the country now.

157. You say you come on the level at High-street on the Collingwood line, and run on piers to the Collingwood station?—Yes.

158. You would go through private property. What objection would there be to running it along Hobble-street?—One portion has reserves on one side, and there are no shops until you come down a good way?—I do not think you could take possession of that street without compensating the property-holders on each side, and a railway would be a nuisance. You would have to take possession of the street for your piers. Of course, it is just as feasible as going up a street in New York, and liable to the same objection. In New York they have this excise, that to buy any property on either side would involve enormous expense, but that they “fettered” the corporation out of the street; it was a much easier matter than it would be here.

159. By Mr. Charter.—Was there no compensation allowed to the property owners on each side of the street there?—I think not, but I do not know whether compensation was not given to the owners and councils.

160. By Mr. J. S. White.—You based your estimate on a million of people within the radius of the city and suburbs?—A long way before that. I believe if we had an accession of 100,000 to our present population both the railways and trains would pay well.

161. Do you think, with the people leaving our shores so rapidly, it is advisable to do anything at present with these lines?—I do not anticipate they will continue to leave. That is only a phase of the period; the tide may turn, and people will come back.

162. You see people are going to the Cape, and Western Australia has £1,000,000 to spend in work?—I think the population in our metropolis is about stationary. I do not think we are losing more than we are gaining. I took the gloomy view that Victoria was going to the dogs and never recover, I would say you should not spend another penny; but I do not.

163. How much do you consider passenger traffic within the last eighteen months as it was some time before?—Last year, I believe, it was very nearly the same as the year before, I have been told so. The last year’s Report has not been made public yet.

164. You make a survey along Wellington-palace for the Collingwood line?—Yes.

165. Did you ever survey further along the Richmond line to get in the Richmond Cricket Ground, leaving it on the west?—That was the original proposal.

166. Would that not be a great saving?—In what respect?

167. To use a portion of the line you have at present?—No; you could not use a portion of the present line.

168. Could you not put down extra rails?—No, because the present lines—

169. Have plenty of work to do?—They will have in a short time.

170. Would you not supply the cricket ground and put the people who wanted to go there on to the spot by that means?—Yes. If you look at the plan you will see that was a proposal that was considered by the other Committee and rejected.

171. You might have been cutting and banking to do?—I do not recollect what it is, but I do not think you would save anything usefully in the construction.

172. You have not surveyed with a view of running pretty near the surface at Hobville-street, and doing away with the tunnel?—No, I do not think you could rise sufficiently to do that. You have to locate your levels to suit the continuation of the line down to Victoria-street, and a covered way made best.

173. By Mr. Caven.—In regard to the rolling-stock? In the estimate given, Appendix A, 4 says,—"Rolling-stock is proposed to consist of first engines, at £3,500—£4,500; 20 carriages, at £1,000—£310; 12, total, £45,000. This amount has not been included in the cost of construction estimated by the Engineer-in-Chief, as the stock would be used for other suburban traffic, and could not, therefore, be properly charged exclusively to this line." Do you think that should not be deducted to construction of the line?—The portion of it that is fairly chargeable to the line.

174. Would not the whole of it?—No, because the trains would run right through to Heidelberg or Preston, those trains that are to be made up in that way, so that only a portion of the cost should be charged to the new line.
174. As we do not require the rolling-stock now, and in the event of the new line being built we should have to have it, should it not be charged to the new line?—It does not follow that it must be new stock; it is only the mode of making up the trains.

175. Some of the stock is in existence!—Yes: as far as the engines are concerned, I am pretty sure they would not require new engines.

176. Have they plenty of engines suitable for the work at present?—Yes, that is the "E" engines, the heavy suburban engines.

177. Have they plenty of carriages too?—They have. Some of the present trains running to Heidelberg and Preston would be turned on to those new routes.

178. That is not sufficiently explained here, I think?—That is my view of the matter.

179. You say the ruling grade from Prince's-bridge to Collingwood is 1 in 94?—Yes.

180. And from Collingwood to Northcote is that not 1 in 50?—Yes.

181. Would that not affect the whole question on which your estimates are based? Would not the 1 in 50 rule the whole thing?—Yes, but if you run from Prince's-bridge to Collingwood the 1 in 94 would rule, in my mind. The 1 in 94 is given as an actual fact, but it would have no influence on the suburban traffic one way or the other.

182. In the departmental return I think you do not allow for the duplication of the line to Clifton Hill?—I have not allowed for that because it is the Commissioners' work on an existing railway, and if he considers the suburban traffic should go from Clifton Hill to Collingwood he makes provision by duplicating the line. 

183. The only reason you did not include it in your former estimates was, it was not your business?—No, it was the Commissioner's business.

184. You have pointed out very clearly that two lines are necessary eventually, but that one line should be made before the other?—No, "If one line is made before the other, which should it be," was the question, and I said Collingwood. That is my opinion; it has always been my opinion.

185. Is that the sole reason you have given. In a letter we have there is a profit shown on the working of an equal loss on the other?—That does not come from my estimate of revenue and working. I think the population of Collingwood wants it more than the other.

186. By Mr. J. S. White.—You have not stated what proportion will go to each?—No, but I understand the Commissioner has.

187. You said just now you have plenty of engines. It says here five engines. How many does it take to do the St. Kilda traffic?—I depend on how many trains they have.

188. You said they had ten-minute trains?—It is only 3 miles, and they would run in eight or ten minutes.

189. Would there not be five engines required for either of these proposed lines?—If the trains run at the same intervals and they run to the same length.

190. Why are not five charged?—It is not my return; but I suppose they would not give the same service. It would be a blunder if they have not provided for the necessary number of engines.

191. As they say the engines and carriages are to be used for other lines, they have not put down the charge: we say if it is the same as the St. Kilda line it should have been put down as a charge?—Yes. In my estimate of the result of these lines I have allowed for rolling-stock, and it was based on the actual rolling-stock on the south suburban lines.

192. By the Hon. B. Melville.—How long have you been studying this northern suburban public: how long have communications been passing between your office and the Committee on this subject?—Five or six years.

193. Has the knowledge gained been stationary or have we improved it in the last five years?—I think there is no new light on it, except there has been a great modification in the circumstances of the colony.

194. Suppose there were no trains in competition, that you had a clean sheet, are those two lines the best you could select?—I think so.

195. Are you now able, with the experience that you have of the trains in competition with the south suburban lines, to estimate their competition?—I think so. I think we should be in a position to estimate the competition.

196. What good reason could you give the Committee for putting these lines there at all? Suppose you were asked, what reason could you give for the existence of these lines?—My general answer would be—there is a population of 80,000 people who are interested and want the lines, to have a cheap, quick, comfortable, and safe service into and out of the city.

197. What is your time from Fitzroy now to Flinders-street by rail?—I do not know.

198. At present you take from 23 to 25 minutes from Fitzroy, and from Collingwood 25, 24, and 26 minutes. What will you do with them by your new proposals; what will it save in time?—The journey should be done in four minutes to the mile, from four to three minutes to the mile; that would be, say, nine minutes to 3 miles.

199. If you can do this journey in from nine to ten minutes, will the trains have the traffic or will you have it?—I anticipate the railway will have at least two-thirds of the suburban traffic.

200. Time is the essence of the whole affair?—Time and money.

201. Could you take the trade if you took from fifteen to twenty minutes?—It depends on the relative fares by train and train. Many people, to save money, would take the train even if it took them the same time as to go by the tram.

202. Your estimate is to run to Fitzroy in from seven to ten minutes?—Yes; say nine minutes.

203. Does that get over the difficulty of profitable return; if you are permitted to do it in the time, you seem to think your return is assured?—Yes; I think the time and the fares together will tell greatly in favour of the railway.

204. You are aware it was the trains that attacked the railways in the south?—Yes.

205. They were not afraid to do it!—The railways were there and the trains came and interlaced.

206. Do you know what your loss was when they came?—I believe it was pretty serious.

207. Have you any idea of it?—No, I have not gone into it.
288. Mr. Speight, in his sworn evidence, says—"I put that down as each tramway line has been opened that our receipts have fallen off. We have been subject to competition on those lines by the remaining railroads to St. Kilda, Bulleen, and Toorak, and we have naturally watched the effect of those tram lines on us, and I put it down broadly that the opening of the tram has lost us upon our natural growth of traffic £50,000 a year"?—Yes.

290. You are to turn the tables on them in this case and return the compliment?—That £30,000 a year would be about 10 per cent. of the revenue on the south suburban lines.

291. I ought to add that Mr. Speight says—"We have gradually begun again to recover ourselves"; that is six years ago. Was there an estimate of profit out of the north suburban trains made for our first inquiry?—I have no idea. I do not remember reading about it.

291. You have made a complete scheme showing their profit and so on?—The Commissioner has done that.

292. Do you agree with Mr. Speight and the engines that one set of rails would not be able to take the traffic if an acccension of population came?—Yes, I quite agree with that.

293. Would a common line extend the time of travelling necessarily, by these lines coming in from Collingwood, or vice versa?—Yes.

294. It would be necessarily fatal to the remunerative nature of the undertaking if you took more time?—Yes; it would be an obstacle and an objection, of course.

295. Do you think the present population, just as it is, will sustain the traffic for trams and rail if you get so much traffic?—The construction of these lines would necessarily hurt the tram, undoubtedly.

296. Would not the accession of population there equalize and perhaps do as it has done on some other lines?—Yes, that is what I anticipate. I anticipate an increase of population, but some people do not; they think we will always go back.

217. By Mr. J. S. White.—Do you anticipate that increase on the southern suburbs?—In the metropolitan area, my opinion is that we are on the eve of better times.

218. By the Hon. D. Melville.—If you find that you are all agreed to recommend railways at a cost nearly a million, that is a very different thing to recommending a railway at a cost of between £400,000 and £500,000?—Yes.

219. In lessening the estimate, is the lessening more in the value of property or on the labour?—I think the reduction is about equal on each; I think that the estimate is, practically, two-thirds of what the first Committee recommended. It is about two-thirds on the land, and about two-thirds on the works; that is, we can do now for two-thirds of the money what was proposed to be done then.

220. You have done nothing to secure yourself of getting the properties at your estimate?—The basis of my estimate of the properties is the municipal valuation for 1894, with an increase for compulsorily taking. The margin of the valuation for last year was a little less than for 1894. I have had the larger figures for the properties.

221. You estimate that you will get them for a sum within your estimate?—I think I am entirely safe unless there was a large influx of population immediately and property went up.

222. Both lines are practically about the same distance, and there is nearly the same cost of construction?—There is not a great difference.

223. You have shown one, as to land, with no loss, and the other with a small profit?—I have not shown that; Mr. Mathison will tell you about that.

224. How do you propose to get the work done for the money, by the batty-gang system, or by tender?—I have assumed that I would be allowed to carry out the work by day labour, piece-work, and a system of small contracts. That is, in letting the contract, I will be able to get the work done by gangs of men at such a yard, and doing the tunnelling I will be able to get it done at so much a yard, and to purchase the cement, the bricks, and other material by tender, and put the men on by the piece or by day, that the bridges shall be let singly, or two or three together, by contract, for the steel work, and the Department build the piers and abutments, having previously purchased the materials by contract; the work to be done generally by the piece, day labour, and small contracts.

225. By Mr. Harris.—When you say "small contracts" do you mean to adopt the batty gang principle?—Yes, that is the mode in which we work now.

226. You find that work satisfactorily?—Yes.

227. By the Hon. D. Melville.—What time will it take for the contract?—At least two years, if they go on together, to construct both or either of them.

228. Then you could construct the two without affecting the price of labour?—It would not affect the price of labour much.

229. Then that practically means 1899 to finish the work?—Yes.

230. That means, if we authorize, that we are authorizing something to come into operation in 1899?—Yes, it would take from two years to two years and a half to construct the railways.

231. By Mr. J. S. White.—You said just now cheapness, and comfort, and time were the reasons the railways would pay; can you show us that there is more comfort in riding in a train than on a train?—Yes.

232. And a saving in quickness?—Yes.

233. If a man has to walk half-a-mile to a station?—The money part of the question comes in then.

234. And then they have to take a tram to go to the centre of the city?—That would be a penny. The fact is, we do get traffic on our suburban railways.

235. Can you tell us how much traffic you expect to take from the trams to make your lines pay?—I should say at least 35 per cent. of their passengers, and we would get lots of people who do not use the trams now.

236. By Mr. Harris.—The tram, as a rule, catch the traffic, and the trains, as a rule, evade it?—[No answer.]

237. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Mr. Speight thought the lines would bring in £1,000,000 a mile of revenue based on the south suburban traffic?—Yes.

238. 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 £1,000,000 now—that is, a revenue of £50,000 altogether from the two lines, five miles long.
229. Mr. Speight says, further—"Looking at it from a railway point of view, I think that those northern suburban lines have a greater likelihood of responding quickly than any other lines in the Bill. Do you agree with that?—That was the octopus Bill?"

230. Yes?—Yes.

231. Do you think those lines would be the most likely to pay of any?—Yes.

232. By Mr. J. S. White.—Do you agree with all the recommendations of Mr. Speight about the northern lines, because Mr. Speight is brought in everywhere and then I do not know what Mr. Speight said.

233. By Mr. Barton.—Would you be inclined to modify your opinion on railway construction and management from 1890 to 1896?—I do not think I have changed my views.

234. You have learned nothing and forgotten nothing?—I hope I am learning something every day, but I was always an advocate for economical construction.

235. By the Hon. D. McArthur.—Have you strengthened or shortened those lines from the first?—Shortened them a little.

236. By Mr. J. S. White.—You see that loop coming in there—[pointing to the plan]—would you favour that provision to bring the Heidelberg traffic to Spencer-street, and if we continue the Heidelberg line on would you consider it would be necessary to construct that to connect with Northcote?—I do not think it would pay for the volume of traffic that now comes over the Heidelberg line. I do not think it would be justified now, because the traffic can go direct to Clifton Hill and then back to Spencer-street, but if the traffic increased that could be done. If I am to give an opinion as to the estimated cost of Mr. Millane’s scheme I have not any data; I have no sections.

237. By Mr. Barton.—The question of compensation would enter very largely into this, which would affect the municipalities even if it did not affect private people?—Yes.

238. By the Chairman.—If the Committee have omitted anything they would be glad to hear anything further that you have to say on this subject?—There is nothing that I recollect, only I may tell you further, as regards the number of people who travel by tram and train, that a recent estimate for the city of New York was made, showing that for every head of a population amounting to 1,800,000 they are estimated to travel 200 times a year. The Melbourne population is a very travelling population. I think they travel about 150 times for every head, and I think that such a suburban population will ultimately reach a figure like that I mentioned, to be divided between the trams and railways.

239. By Mr. J. S. White.—You calculate on a larger population than we have at present?—No. In my estimate of revenue I only allowed for each person travelling 100 times. As to the Commissioner’s estimate of 155 times, I do not know how that is arrived at. In the case of the population, he has not counted any of the outside population; he has only taken the population of the two municipalities or two cities. If you take the south suburban lines, with a length of 10½ miles— that is to Port Melbourne, St. Kilda, Brighton, and Hawthorn—the revenue is £29,000 or £33,000 for 1895, and each mile of that represents £20,000; so, if you take £10,000 as the revenue for the north suburban lines, it seems to me to be a low estimate.

240. Then, if I understand it right, Mr. Speight under-estimated in 1890?—Yes, or that basis.

241. Your revenue has increased, has it not?—Not on the south suburban lines, I think.

242. By Mr. J. S. White.—How would you make out that the people would travel similarly; would not a great portion of the people from Carlton walk, as against those coming from Princes, say?—How about Port Melbourne? People also walk from Richmond and South Melbourne. In the one case, £20,000 a mile has been estimated; in the other case an actual revenue of £20,000 a mile has been received, so I say £10,000 appears a perfectly safe estimate for the north suburban lines.

243. By the Hon. D. McArthur.—That is cutting off one-half?—Yes. In the £20,000 a mile, that includes the goods traffic from Sandridge, but that was not a large item in 1895; so, on the whole, I think the north suburban lines seem to have a good future.

244. Have you any reliable statistics about the tram lines as to how you make your estimates?—I quoted the tramway traffic for the last year, as published by the company.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned.
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Walter Thomas, sworn and examined.

253. By the Chairman.—What do you?—An accountant and farmer at Whittlesea, and councillor of the shire of Whittlesea. I have been over forty years in the district, and I know the country between Melbourne and Whittlesea intimately.

254. You have a railway to Whittlesea?—Yes.

255. Is the arrangement not satisfactory?—No. We have got to travel a roundabout route to get to the city, and the fares are a drawback to the line.

256. If the fare was much lower, would the line pay the Department better than it does now?—I am certain of it. The fare from South Yarra, which I am more particularly interested in, is 2s. 6d. 2nd class and 2s. 1d. 1st class return—that is only to North Fitzroy, where the majority of the people come to.

257. What would be a fair thing?—I believe 2s. return for the same distance 2nd class, and 3s. 1st class, would be better. I believe it would nearly double the number of passengers. I live alongside the road, about half-a-mile this side of the railway station, and there are as many passengers going up and down by vehicles on the road as before there was a railway there.
283. Is the population the same?—I think it is more, particularly in the back country between the Penny and Arthur’s Creek. Perhaps there is a little less in the valley, but on the whole there is an increase in the population.

284. Do you know the population of the shire of Whitianga, cost of the dividing range, between the Pleasy and the Dares Creek?—I cannot say exactly. The Morang division. Dares Creek. The electoral register had 477 residents at the last census. I do not think it has varied much since. I cannot say the population of the Yen Yen division.

285. Do you know anything about the traffic on the railway now?—I have had a good deal to do with the traffic in this way, and another.

286. Do you know the number who travel up and down every day, on the average?—No.

287. Do you know the quantity of milk carried?—There is a considerable quantity of milk. There were nearly 30 cans on the South Yen Yen railway station this morning, and that is smaller than it has been this season. That was the morning’s supply.

288. Do you know the number of milking cows in the district that feeds the Whitianga line?—I cannot say exactly. I should think, on the whole, there must be some thousands; it is essentially a dairying district.

289. Do you know the area under crop in the valley of the Penny, including Arthur’s Creek?—I could not give you that information.

290. You want direct communication?—Yes.

291. Into whose.—Firears-street.

292. Are you in favour of the Fitzroy route?—I am in favour of the Young-cart route that the municipalities north of the Merri Creek agreed upon.

293. How much shorter would that be than going round by the Royal Park?—Going round by Royal Park to Whitianga we have to travel 25 miles; 21 miles by the Young-cart route we would have to travel.

294. By Mr. J. S. White.—Is not the road from the Preston Reservoir the most direct road to Melbourne—so line would make it nearer than that?—Most decidedly it would. It is one of the worst roads in the colony—it is one mass of turns. I meant the road from Whitianga to Melbourne via Preston Reservoir.

295. From Preston to Melbourne would any railway be more direct than the present mechanical road?—I do not think so.

296. From Preston to Melbourne is 8 miles; going round by Royal Park it is 10 miles?—Yes, but Preston is only 7 miles from Melbourne by the mile posts on the Plenty road.

297. The 8-mile post is at the Reservoir station.—The 7-mile post is at the top of the hill at the Shannock. Even according to your calculation there is 2 miles difference beyond that; we have the descent to Epping which increases the difference.

298. By the Chairman.—The difference can only arise from the North Fitzroy branch to?—That is all. There is one thing in connexion with the line I would like to mention—that is, that the line up there, from the nature of the occupation of the people, wants to be brought in as direct as possible. If they are handicapped by having to go round with their produce they will take other means of getting it to market—it wants to be brought within reasonable limits to get the trade. I get goods delivered at my place into the store for 6s. 6d. per ton. If I get a ton-weight taken to the South Yen Yen station I pay 6s. 6d., and have to carry it away myself. That shows there must be something wrong in the railways.

299. By Mr. Burton.—Must it not be the bad state of things with the canoes that they are glad to get anything?—I cannot say. The railways should be good to get anything too make them pay. If you carry 10 tons at 6s. 6d. per ton, it is better than carrying 2 tons at 6s. You can get a whole truck for less money than 10s. a ton; you get a truck holding 4 tons for 18s.

300. Is that still excessive?—No, it is the single one that I object to; it is not everybody who can get a truck load at once.

301. By Mr. Harris.—Has that price only just been put on?—No, it has existed for years.

302. By the Chairman.—Are there regular carriers on the road?—They take wood and green stuff into town and return; they are not regular carriers.

303. By Mr. Burton.—It is a mutually affaires?—No, it is pounds, shillings, and pence.

304. Your neighbours do the carrying?—No, you may live 10 miles away and bring me a load; he is passing up and down.

305. By Dr. J. S. White.—If the fares were reduced by half, the railways would double the traffic?—I am positive of it.

306. Would that increase the revenue very much?—I cannot say it would.

307. Are you aware that that law does not pay working expenses by nearly £200 per annum?—I saw that in the Argus, but that is taking the worst end of the line.

308. That is where the farmers travel?—They travel right through from one end to the other.

309. If that were cut off altogether, you would save nearly £5,000 a year?—On the same principle if you have a farm with 20 acres of good land and the remainder is bad, if you cut off the bad land you would have the good land left.

310. If the railway came straight and saved two miles, would the milk traffic go more by rail?—I could not say; keeping in view the fact that the people have to deliver the milk to different people in town; perhaps it might pay them better to bring it in vehicles direct. It would depend on whether it would pay them better to deliver it by their own carts or send it by rail. With regard to the passenger tickets, my contention is that if they were reduced to 3s. first and 2s. second from South Yen Yen to North Fitzroy you would get more than double the number of passengers.

311. By Mr. J. S. White.—If the fare were reduced to North Fitzroy you do not want an extension of the line?—Yes, when you get there you have to pay the tram backwards and forwards. You can go to Regent-street, Preston, for 3d., second class return. When you come to North Fitzroy you have to pay 6d. to get backwards and forwards in the tram.

312. Even without the railway you think it would be an advantage if the fares were reduced to Fitzroy—it would improve the present line?—I think it would. It would improve it vastly if the line went right through. It is hardly fair for our line to be handicapped by having the cost of this Outer Circle
tucked on to it in considering the expenses, that is, taking the bad part of the line and leaving the good—I do not think that is fair at all.

291. By the Hon. D. Mehaffy.—You get out at North Fitzroy—do you know the distance between North Fitzroy and Flinders-street by Young-street?—By the Royal Park it is 3-70 miles; Hodde-street, 4-30; and by Young-street, 3-10 miles.

292. As to going round by Cauldon and the Royal Park, do you know any one who goes that way to Spencer-street?—Occasionally there are a few. I could not tell; from Northcote there may be some, but in the trains coming out of our way it is only an occasional passenger who goes that way.

293. To get into the city you are now asked to travel all the way round instead of coming straight?

—Yes, that is how we are asked to go.

294. Does any one complain of that?—Yes, I complain myself.

295. You do not go?—No, I pay the trains instead, whereas I would pay the train if I came through.

296. If the train came through you would come right through into the station?—The major portion would go, not all of us, either to Flinders-street or the intermediate stations between here and North Fitzroy.

297. If the short line from Flinders-street to Whiteleys and Yan Yean were a straight-out line with corresponding fares, the population would increase?—Yes, by keeps and bounds—it would soon vie with the southern suburbs. I have been in the agency line up there, and I am continually met with bayness coming there for property, but they say—"Look at your train service." I find a gentleman up on Saturday, an almost certain purchaser of land, and he feels half inclined to hold back to see what will be the result of the Committee's deliberations.

298. By Mr. J. S. White.—Would you go up there to reside?—He would.

299. He would not want to use the southern suburbs line then; the population is not increasing, so he must come from somewhere?—I think it will increase. If the colony's going to the bad there is no use in making railways at all, but I have not that ideal.

300. You said he came to you, and would be a likely buyer if there were a line?—Yes; he was a New South Wales resident coming to settle in Victoria.

301. By the Chairman.—Does the fruit that comes down the line from Yan Yean come out at North Fitzroy?—Not much; it goes round to North Melbourne and Spencer-street. Those people also find it a great convenience not to have shorter communications.

302. What proportion of the fruit grown in that district comes by rail?—A very small proportion. I think there are only three growers who are now sending fruit by rail on account of the inconvenience of the services.

303. Supposing you had a direct line by Young-street, which station would the growers send the fruit to then?—I think it would be best to both—they would divide it. Those that are going to Spencer-street now would go on the market is made there, but all those who send to Fitzroy and Collingwood use their own wagons now.

304. None of the fruit that comes by rail to Spencer-street has to come back to Victoria-street?—Yes, nine-tenths of it. I believe very few of the growers use their own vehicles on account of the carriage at the end.

305. If you have a direct line, would any of the stations be nearer to the Victoria Market than Spencer-street?—I could not say.

306. By the Hon. E. Morris.—What would it cost per car to bring it in by the road?—It is all carried by their own vehicles. They take in about 25 cars, up to 2 tons, with two and sometimes four horses.

307. Do you think there is any likelihood, when the fruit is wanted all over the town, of the sending by the train—would they not bring it with their own vehicles?—I do not think you would get the whole of the fruit, but you would get a good lot if you have direct communication with stations on the way between North Fitzroy and Flinders-street.

308. What would be the difference between delivering this fruit from Spencer-street to the markets and taking it in their own cars?—I suppose it would make a difference of from 5s. to 10s. on each load.

309. They are not likely to send it by rail when they are sending in different places?—They may do so; they would keep a cart handy and deliver it to the wholesale buyers—that is how Mr. Draper does. In the fruit season he keeps a horse and cart to take his fruit from Spencer-street.

310. What does fruit cost on the line?—It will cost quite 6s. a ton to cart with their own horses—fruit is a bulky article.

311. How many cases go to the ton?—About 50.

312. How many cases can you put in a wagon with two horses?—Some of them have as high as 100, but the generality is from 60 to 80 cases.

313. They would make a trip a day?—No, they go down one day and up the next. The fruit-growing district is from 3 to 7 miles back from the railway.

314. It means another expense to the grower if he has to put the fruit into the train and then take it from Spencer-street to the different shops—it must be much cheaper to deliver it himself?—Not always. If they have a full load to distribute to various shops throughout the place it comes cheaper, no doubt, but if they have not a full load, which is generally the case, it pays better to send it by train.

315. Do you think the railway would benefit much by the fruit?—I think so, particularly if things get better, and the train service could be made to suit people better. The Railway Department has tried to meet them in the train service.

316. By Mr. Hare.—Is it the only round-about manner in which the line is built that has prevented the Department from meeting them?—Yes, there is no doubt the Railway Commissioners have been handicapped in devising with the district through the extra mileage they have to consider.

317. By Mr. J. S. White.—You expect there will be a great deal more fruit in the colony than is required for consumption?—Yes, there will be a great deal of exportation.

318. For that purpose it will go by rail?—Yes, I am convinced it will. They can land it right into the station, and it is a matter of saving hauling.

319. For expert they would land it near the wharves at Spencer-street?—They are as close to the wharf at Flinders-street as at Spencer-street.
320. Goods do not usually come that way? — We cannot send them that way; we have not the connection; we would send them the shortest route.

321. There is no depot for goods outside Spencer-street, so they would have to go that way? —

Unless the trade justified ships being erected for them.

322. They would have to go to the wharf for shipment, but it would be easier to go direct to the wharf from Spencer-street than go to Flinders-street? — There is direct communication from Flinders-street.

323. There are no ships taking fruit this side of Spencer-street, and if it went this way round by Flinders-street it would be so far away as going round by North Melbourne? — I question if there is not even a considerable difference in the distance. The fruit-growing up there is going to be the largest industry in the district. The ground area is increasing by leaps and bounds.

324. By the Chairman. — Supposing there are from 15,000 to 20,000 tons of fruit coming down the Plenty-road, how much of this would be exported? — I think more than half would be exported.

325. Do you know of your own knowledge that they export one-half, say, 8,000 or 10,000 tons?

— I could not say. They have exported a lot this last year, but I have not the figures. This year they are looking forward to more than doubling it.

326. Does the produce of 20,000 acres come down that road? — Yes, I think so, and more.

327. Taking it at 2,000 acres and allowing 7 tons to the acre, that would be 14,000 tons? — Yes, but that is a very low estimate.

328. You are not a fruit-grower? — No.

329. Do you know what damage is done to the fruit in getting it down the Plenty-road as compared with taking it by rail? — I have been informed by the fruit-growers that they could send such fruit as pears and apples by rail, and it would not be much damaged; whereas in getting by the road at times it is a good deal damaged. Our road has been very rough lately.

330. Do they cart milk from beyond Yan Yean, you too? — Not to toivt. It would be cleared before it got to Melbourne. In hot weather it would be impossible to carry it.

331. By Mr. Crown. — Where does this 14,000 tons of fruit go to? — It is distributed over Melbourne and suburbs, and goes to the other colonies, and some is exported home.

332. How much is exported? — I believe nearly one-half.

333. Where do they send it to or export it to? — I believe it comes to Spencer-street, independently of what is carried by road.

334. Then it would go by the same line as at present? — Not if there were a direct line. Many of the boats go from the wharf at Flinders-street for the intercolonial trade.

335. You could not unload from the Flinders-street wharf? — Perhaps it would go to Spencer-street; I cannot say.

336. By Mr. Harris. — You say about half of the fruit is exported; I understand you to say previously you were not able to say what quantity of fruit was exported? — I meant to Great Britain, but a considerable portion goes to the other colonies.

337. By Mr. J. S. White. — You said there were 2,000 acres under cultivation; what age with a tree before it will produce 7 tons to the acre? — Not being an expert, I would not like to give an opinion on that—some may get more, and some less. I suppose that from five to twelve year old trees 7 tons would be the average.

338. Up to five years it would vary from 1 ton to 4 or 5? — Yes, the quality of the land has a great deal to do with it.

339. As your district is likely to receive a benefit from the line, would it be prepared to guarantee a portion of the loss, if any? — I could not pledge the district to that without consulting them.

340. In the first place, there is the land to be got? — That land will have to be provided undoubtedly — we have got to find that, too. doubt.

341. You have no objection to join with the Northern Suburbs in finding the money yourselves to start with? — I cannot say. I was present when the Commissioner of Railways had an offer made to him to have the line constructed by private enterprise, and then we were not allowed to have it built.

The meeting adjourned.

Bartle Frere, McCormick, sworn and examined.


343. Is your shire interested in this matter? — Yes; the railway comes to the Epping riding. The riding which I represent has no railway at all. We think by having a direct railway as short and cheap as we can get it the Government may see their way clear to bring a branch and tap the North-Eastern line and join it to Epping, to bring a portion of the traffic of the North-Eastern line round the other side of the city, and by getting that we would get a railway in our district.

344. By Mr. J. S. White. — Are you the owner of much land there? — I live with my father; he owns half a section.

345. Are you prepared to guarantee any loss there may be on the line and make it a first charge on your land? — That line does not come into our district.

346. You want a branch line from the main line? — We think by getting a direct line we may afterwards get a line from the North-Eastern joined on to Epping from Beveridge.

347. If you knew you would get a cross line, would you be in favour of this line? — For the benefit of the Epping riding I would.

348. Would it improve the value of your land? — I cannot say; it would.

349. Not making your land any more valuable, you would not care to join in a guarantee that this line will pay when constructed? — I think the Government ought to be the best judges of that. I could not say whether it would pay or not.

350. You come here as president of the shire, in the interests of the whole shire? — Yes.

351. And you say your shire is to benefit by a direct route; if so, are the owners of the land prepared to guarantee the loss if the line does not pay? — The shire has not the management of the railway; they might make it pay if they had. In that case, I think they would give a guarantee.

The meeting adjourned.
James Ryan, sworn and examined.

352. By the Hon. D. Melville.—What are you?—Secretary of the shires of Whittlesea and Epping.

353. The proposal mentioned to you direct lines from Flinders-street to Fitzroy and Collingwood; will you say, if you think the proposals; will the Fitzroy line be of any advantage to your district?—Having been connected with the agitation for the Whittlesea line for some 40 odd years, since 1853, and having travelled on the Whittlesea line, I think, more than any other passenger between Whittlesea and North Fitzroy, I would submit a few general facts without going into details. Those details we have left to Mr. Hume and Mr. Bush. I may say we have coveted a deal of time and expense in developing the scheme that is submitted to you. Generally speaking, we object to going round by Spencer-street, but, before I go into the subject, I wish to remark that the publication by the Argus of any line is very unfair and ungenerous, as showing weak points, and detaching us from North Fitzroy. Our line is locally known as the Whittlesea and Fitzroy line, and it is very unfair of the Department to excite the best portion of the line and leave us the poorer portion.

354. By Mr. J. S. White.—There might be a greater loss on the other portion?—I am not sure of that, but speaking generally, our sympathy are with North Fitzroy—we travel by that line. I travelled by it this morning, and I took the tram to come in. It is very rarely we go to Spencer-street unless we have direct business at the end of the city. We are not in favour of outer circles, whether by Spencer-street or by Collingwood—we want the most direct and cheapest line into the city. As regards the traffic, if the fares were reduced to 5c. to 2s., it would be better for the Railway Department to carry twelve people at 2s. than six at 3s. That is a very big question, and requires a good deal of working out. As regards the fruit, I prepared all the statistics for the Government Statistic, but I have no copy of them with me. The fruit industry of our district is the best industry, and is capable of a large development—some of the fruit is carried by road, and a large portion is carried by train. The train hours are unsuitable; they are either too early or too late to suit the market.

355. By Mr. Harris.—Have you asked for them to be altered?—Yes. We have had petitions from the Whittlesea Shire Council to the late commissioners, and have asked for an alteration which, if carried out, would induce nearly all the fruit to be carried by train. We know very well that fruit will suffer by being carried on the road, which takes three hours, whereas by train it will be delivered in little more than an hour.

356. By Mr. J. S. White.—You first agitated for a line to be constructed to Whittlesea?—Yes.

357. That was in 1889. When you were agitating for the extension to Whittlesea, you were alive a line was then constructed that took you into Spencer-street?—Yes, it was a continuation from Spencer-street.

358. Why did you not complain then that you wanted a direct route?—It is hardly a fair question—why should we complain about matters that occurred years ago. We are now in different circumstances to what we were then.

359. After the line was constructed you say—"We must have a line to connect this line in."—was not the line constructed as one line from Spencer-street through to Whittlesea, and did you then say one word about the direct road?—There are records where I myself, individually have complained the principle of going round by Spencer-street and have advocated a direct route for a number of years.

360. Was there ever a meeting convened in your district to condemn the line from Whittlesea to Spencer-street?—Before the line was constructed we advocated the tram to be turned into a railway—40 years ago— we accepted the present route to Spencer-street because we could not get any better, but we wanted a direct route that the people submit to you through Fitzroy, Royal-street, and Johnson-road.

361. You accepted it, knowing at the time that this line would be a failure?—I do not admit that.

362. Is it not a failure, coming round?—We accepted it because we could not get any better. I do not say it is a failure, but a direct line would be a better one.

363. Why did you not agitate for the direct line then?—When the old tram was established we advocated that that tram should be direct through Fitzroy—Spencer-street was never mentioned in those days. The population of the district round the South Yarra station is about 600. The population of Whittlesea and Shirley district is about from 600 to 700, taking in the mountain, and the population of the shire south of South Yarra station would be between 500 and 600. Another word, the population of the shire of Whittlesea is about 1,400. As regards the statistics of crops, though preparing those for the Government Statistic, I do not keep copies of them; any information about the crops you can get from the Statistic's Department.

364. By the Chairman.—Do you know the acreage under fruit in the shire of Whittlesea?—No, the Government Statistic has all the information about the acreage and fruit grown.

365. Have you always been in that information?—Every year. The number of acres under fruit, and the number of boxes of different fruit collected.

366. Do the Department publish it in their statistics?—Not in detail.

367. Do they publish the acreage?—I do not know. I have not noticed it. As to the weight of fruit, there is one peach tree there about ten or twelve years old, and there were 5 cwt. taken off that one tree.

368. By Mr. Harris.—Are any other particulars given in the information supplied to the Statistic?—Yes, the quantity of hay and green crops and general farm produce. There is a large quantity of milk sent down, and we give the number of gallons of milk and the weight of the produced.

369. Would the people that you are able to speak for being willing to give a guarantee for the interest and cost of construction?—I do not think the subject has been admitted to the ratepayers, and I am afraid the suggestion would not be favorably entertained by them. I understand, under the new Railway Act, that is the case, and I do not think it would apply in this case of the extension of an old line.

370. By Mr. J. S. White.—Are you valuer there?—I am valuer for the shire of Whittlesea, not for Epping.

371. It would be a great advantage to have a direct line through Fitzroy; would the capital value of your district increase through that direct line?—I think it would lead to a large development of settlement in the district.

372. By that means it would increase the value of the land?—It would increase the settlement and population, and special sites would be picked up for gentlemen's residences.
373. When the line was first constructed to Whittlesea, did it increase the value of the land very much? In some cases it did, because we send our milk down by train, whereas before we had to send it by road. The farms where milk is produced are more valuable since the railway was built than they were before.

374. By Mr. Howitt.—Suppose the extension that you desire is provided, how much would it add to the value of the land? That would strongly depend upon circumstances. It would be utterly impossible to give an estimate now.

375. The complaint at the present time is the want of proper railway connections; would those extensions add to the value of the land?—I think they would increase the value of the land as regards dairy farms and orchards. I could not say by how much.

The meeting adjourned.

376. Mr. Thomas.—I was secretary of the railway league right up to the time the railway was made, and we agitated to get a direct route. Failing that we were glad to get the other. The agitation was kept up right up until the line was made.

William Pearse, sworn and examined.

377. By the Hon. D. Melville.—What have you to say to the Committee on this matter?—The only way I look at the matter is that it is an inquiry into the desirability of having a direct line of railway to the northern suburbs. If that is the proper scope of the inquiry, I think, before setting the question of how the money is to be earned by that line, you must ask what the traffic is to consist of, either passengers or goods. According to my own opinion, the only way to make the line pay is to choose a route that will grow passenger traffic. I have been a resident of the suburbs now for about 40 years, and I know where the population of Melbourne is, and I do not think you have a more thickly populated area in the colony of Victoria than the area that this line should serve, that is from Flinders-street to Northcote and Flinders-street to Collingwood and Clifton Hill. It should not be two lines; it should be one direct line, and a service on from the other line of country into it. I do not think the line known as the Collingwood line below Hoddle-street between Hoddle-street and the river, should ever have been suggested for passenger traffic. It is far too away from the population that it attempts to serve; I mean the population of Collingwood. There is very little population between Hoddle-street and the river except at one point where it reaches Simpson's road, Richmond, but the extension of Collingwood, that is between Wellington-street and Smith street, we are speaking of a great street when we speak of Smith-street Collingwood. On one side is Fitzroy, and the other side Collingwood. I am open to correction, but I do not think you have a suburban street in the whole of the Australian colonies equal to it for business. If that is so, whatever is the use of telling us that you are providing a railway station about three-quarters of a mile away from it. The stations on the Collingwood route below Hoddle-street would be no earthly use to Smith-street. I was a shopkeeper for many years in Smith-street, and I know the street I am speaking of. I am certain that the stations on the Collingwood route below Hoddle-street would be no use whatever to Smith-street. It simply means taking the business traffic away from the street, business which they have built up. On the Collingwood route there is no provision for any other station. Collingwood, but to provide station below Hoddle-street, and people cannot get out three-quarters of a mile away and walk up a hill to do business in a street. Then the employés in streets like Smith-street and Brunswick-street, which is only second in importance to Smith-street, are not likely to go and live in the northern suburbs if they have to go that distance to get to a station. The next station on the Collingwood line is at Richmond, on the other side of Simpson's road. I have read a great deal of the tram competition. The tram competition on both routes is about equal. The Collingwood Clifton Hill station is the first on the Collingwood line. Immediately outside the station is the Clifton Hill line of trams. The first station is at the junction, Collingwood, and there you have the Abbotsford line of trams. The third station is at the other side of Simpson's road where you have a third line of trams competing there. The fourth is between Simpson's road and Bridge-road. That station has the Bridge-road line of trams competing with it. The competition of the tram lines is equal on both, and, having settled that question, we have to ask ourselves where is the different earning power of the lines. On the Collingwood route I do not think it would be fair to claim anything like the Richmond population, seeing that they have already got their railway on one portion and they have also got their trams. When you come a little closer in and you get back to Johnston-street station, Mr. Reunick, who must be considered an expert on this question, takes three-quarters of a mile as the gathering ground of the passenger traffic. If that is so, on one side of the Johnston-street station in Collingwood you find before you go a quarter of a mile you are in the River Yarra. The other side of the Yarra is the Studley Park; with high precipitous banks that will never be built on. There is no gathering ground there for the passenger traffic. If you attempt to make three-quarters of a mile gathering ground on the western side you will overlap the Fitzroy route and take the gathering ground altogether away from it. I will admit frankly that I am a Brunswick-street shopkeeper, and have been all my lifetime, I am a resident of Northcote, and I have seen for the last ten years. I have a large interest in Northcote, and I believe I know the feeling of Northcote and what will really affect the town of Northcote.

378. By Mr. Cochrane.—What street would you define running between the two routes that would divide the traffic going to either? I did not think you would take more than i-and-a-half mile gathering ground, but I have read since then that Mr. Reunick says three-quarters of a mile. I would claim every station of the gathering ground as Wellington-street. From Wellington-street, Collingwood, to Nicholson-street, Carlton, must be claimed for the Fitzroy route. From Wellington-street Collingwood might go to the Collingwood line.

379. Do you think many of the people east of Wellington-street would go to the Fitzroy line?—Yes, about half-way again between that and the route, say, between Rupert-street and Palmer-street. But, of course, all the way to South Melbourne, Victoria, or Western Australia, or Western Australia, and South Australia, or any other line, it is all hooked upon as part and parcel of Melbourne. It is continuously built on, only separated from Melbourne by imaginary municipal lines. If that is the case, manufacturing and business will absorb the whole area of Fitzroy and Collingwood. People will live further out, and you must choose the line which will
not only save whatever traffic there is from Fitzroy and Collingwood to Melbourne, which I admit will be small, but the outside trouble of people living from Northcote to Whittlesea and Collingwood to Heidelberg. There is no reason why this area should not be densely populated in the future, and very likely it will be. We know what is keeping that place back; it is the want of the same railway communication that you have south of the Yarra. It is totally a different life for a man north of the Yarra with a family in the country, and there is no reason why that difference should exist. We, of course, have cheerfully paid our share of taxation and have any burden caused by the railway lines, and we were prepared to make this connection if we were allowed to do it. I, myself, signed a bond in the Fitzroy Town Hall offering to construct this line if we had been given power by Mr. Gillick to do it, and at that time the whole of the money could have been forced to construct this line. I mention that to show that we are not asking for this line as a tax; we ask for it as a matter of necessity. I have a large family of children, and we have seriously considered the question whether it is right of him to compel them to live where we are living (though it is in my own property) without the railway conveniences which they can get south of the Yarra. If that feeling causes itself upon men—a man with a love of his home—how can it be with new people. We feel that as soon as their position is at all improved and their families grow up, they leave the district and go south of the Yarra, somewhere where they can get proper railway communication. If you construct that direct line of railway to Fitzroy, and make the connection along Reilly’s road for the Heidelberg traffic, the whole of the area between Rupert-street, Collingwood, and Carlton would be served by direct railway communication, and you will give short and direct railway communication for all the northern area from Northcote to Whittlesea, also from Collingwood and Clifton Hill to Heidelberg. By this connection you will serve more Collingwood people than by the route known as the Hoddle-street route. That Hoddle-street route only provides one more station that would be of any use to Collingwood; that is the one in Richmond, which will only serve the small portion called the Governor district. The station on the Young-street route will be an immense advantage. The station at Johnston-street and Gertrude-street, Fitzroy, are very close to Wellington-street, and will be of immense advantages to the business people there. There is another matter that we ought to look into, that is the connection from North Carlton round to Findon-street. By the present route to Royal Park it is 5 miles 10 chains to Findon-street. Any connection that could be made along Hoddle-street would make it also 5 miles 10 chains; by the Fitzroy route it would be 5 miles 10 chains. The North Carlton and East Brunswick population is very thick, and it will always be thick. I am quite sure you could lift a good traffic by developing this North Carlton station.

380. By the Hon. D. Medcalf.—Do you think the Department should provide service for this North Carlton traffic?—I think it would be worth their while. The line is at present constructed, and it is simply a matter of utilizing the capital already spent. It is a thick population. I believe you would find you would lift a valuable traffic there.

381. That this be the whole of south-east Brunswick?—Yes.

382. Would you go as far as Sydney road?—No. Just take the North Carlton station. We have no doubt people would go as far as Sydney road. Mentone-street has a good connection with North Carlton; we send our troops there every day. I look upon this line purely as a passenger traffic line. If there is any return to be earned from it it must be by passenger traffic.

383. Should we colour that as a feeder to the line?—Yes, it should be coloured red.

384. It is not to be rated as a separate line?—It ought to be a separate.

385. Do you know how many people live in that portion?—I could not tell you. They are very thick.

386. As thick as any other part?—No. You cannot get any settlement in the colour as thick as Fitzroy itself, but it is much thicker than the gathering ground in Collingwood. Immediately outside this North Fitzroy station you have a good business street of about half-a-mile, with splendid shops on each side of it. They must have a feeding ground to keep that street going. Taking the first station in Northcote on the Whitehorse line, it is 5 miles 20 chains by the Young-street route, and it is 6 miles 60 chains for the present route along Royal Park.

387. That practically means that you are placed 3 miles nearer the centre of the city?—There are 40 chains nearer the centre of the city.

388. So that Northcote is placed 3 miles 40 chains further away than it ought to be?—Yes; worse than that, it is taken by a route that is not to it. Our connection is with Brunswick and Smith streets. That is the way the old line of carts ran. That is the way we drive our own private vehicles. That is the way we have a man who wants to walk from Melbourne to Northcote. We never knew a man who walked from Northcote to Royal Park, and certainly not a man who would walk from Heidelberg by the Hoddle-street route.

389. Have you been mayor of Northcote?—No; I am a councillor.

390. Speaking generally, which of these two lines will bring the State, in your opinion, the most passenger traffic?—I think the only line worth considering is the Fitzroy route. If we cannot have the Fitzroy route, I do not think we should go to the expense of building my line at all. This Hoddle-street line is no use.

391. The Collingwood line would still keep you back?—Yes; it is no use. There is no gathering ground; the stations are too awkward. We would simply cease to the North Fitzroy station and use the tram. Possibly a certain number of people might use the Collingwood route at Northcote, the same as a large number of people now use the Outer Circle route, but there would be no increased traffic. You could not look for any development of traffic by building that line.

392. This straight line reaching your objective point in about five to seven minutes will pay?—Yes, I believe that straight line would be the best-paying line the Government would have after it had been a couple of years in existence. You can see that by the way the tram Company have laid their lines down. They knew the traffic they could expect. It is merely a question of the extension of Melbourne further north.

393. You want Northcote set 3½ miles nearer the centre of the city?—Yes, not only set nearer but giving us a line that will be of some use to us; a line of country that we do business with and must do business with; a line enabling the employes of those two great streets, Brunswick and Smith streets, to come and live with us and fill our places up. If you give us a station, so that the employes of those streets
can come and live with us, they will come, but if they have to go below Hobble-street, Collingwood, we could not hope to find the people there; it is too far distant.

335. It is essential to Northcote and Preston to shorten the distance?—Yes, and if you expect the line to pay, you must take it be the route that will save the traffic, not take it away from the traffic.

336. By Mr. Burton.—Providing this loop were made between Northcote and Clifton Hill, what objection would you see in going on with the Collingwood line, as far as Northcote is concerned?—In the first place, I cannot see what is the reason for asking us to do so. If we have to do that, it makes the distance 60 chains longer. It is 4 miles by the Hobble-street route, and 3 miles 20 chains by the Fitzroy route.

337. What does that difference mean in time?—Not much time certainly.

338. Is it a question of money then?—No.

339. Is it a question of cost to the passengers?—No. There is no reason why we should be asked to go 60 chains further when you can already choose a shorter line that would be of more use to us. Northcote looks upon itself now as a continuation of Fitzroy, inasmuch as we are closely allied with Fitzroy in business, and those two streets—Brunswick and Smith streets—are the streets which we are likely to deal with. If you make that useless connexion joining Northcote on to Hobble-street, you have given us a line 60 chains longer, and take us by a route that is no use to us. We have no business below Hobble-street, and are not likely to have, but we will have a great deal of business, both inwardly and outwardly, if we have that other line.

400. Where would this business be with?—With the residence north of Merri Creek and Northcote and Collingwood.

401. It is not the town connexion you are advocating at all?—Yes. I am. I am advocates a direct line with Flinders-street and that line should be taken by the inns that likely to be of use to us because if this large expenditure is to be made. I am now and various people that business, and are not likely to have. If you consider that this large population for a considerable distance below Smith-street would be served by the Fitzroy line?—I contend that the people as far as Hyperion-street will be served by that line.

402. How many lines of tram do you expect people to cross to go to the railway?—If you give them a proper railway connexion I think they will cross half-a-dozen lines of tram. It is not only the traffic with Melbourne we must look to but the traffic further north. I would not advocate this line at all if I did not think the population of Northcote and Preston was going to increase. The land is all cut up there.

403. You see the yellow lines marked on this map as an alternative scheme by Mr. Millane?—That scheme provides for a junction between the Heidelberg line on the Heidelberg-road, and a consequent loop line from Northcote to the same place, bringing the whole of the traffic down the Heidelberg-road, a very wide 8-chain road, across by a viaduct at the station at the corner of Nicholson-street and Cumberland Road, following down Nicholson-street towards Exaltation, and having a station near Exaltation, and having a station near Exaltation, and having a station at the corner of the parade towards Richmond, another above the Fitzroy Gardens, and so on by that way through Lansdale-street, junctioning at the Model Schools and coming down to Spencer-street. That scheme would be a very good scheme if the line had been laid down before Melbourne had its population, but now the population is settled there.

404. Where?—There it is—[pointing to a map].

405. Does this not tap the population the same as any other line?—No, it does not tap the population the same as any other line. If it were as much as the Fitzroy line taps it, but if this line had been laid down before the population settled there it would be a splendid earning line, but not as good as the Young-street route.

406. Taking into account the saving in not having to purchase property, do you not consider it is worth inquiring into still?—Do not think myself it should be so much a question of what it would cost as what it is likely to earn. I do not mind what good costs so long as I think there is a profit in them. If I were going into this scheme with my own capital I should want to know not so much its cost as what is likely to come out of it. If I were going into it with capital I should want to know not so much its cost as what is likely to come out of it. There is no comparison as it is between the Young-street route. The cost of construction cannot be so great. We are not going to be afraid of $500,000 or $600,000 expenditure. I should be very sorry to think that the colony of Victoria could not consider a question of that sort without fear.

407. Do you consider that the goods traffic will not be an important factor in the earnings of either of those lines?—Not at present, but the passenger traffic would be at once. I am strongly of opinion that it will pay from its first month of construction.

408. You think the goods traffic is not worth considering?—I do not say that, but I dwell particularly on the passenger traffic, because it appears to me that one route is planned out to avoid the passenger traffic, and the other is likely to gather all the passenger traffic in the area.

409. Will it develop a goods traffic from that district?—Yes, it must do. If you get direct communication with that north of the district it must develop fresh ground, because it is of great importance to a man who is producing anything that he reaches the market with it as quickly as he possibly can. I suppose the great value of the Whiteman area is the railway, because the milk they produce is the best product at present. If you establish a northern suburb at Northcote, look what that will be worth to the district further north as a market.

410. What is the difference in the distance, if the line you advocate were constructed?—It is 3 miles shorter by the Fitzroy route than the present Royal Park one.

411. Do you think if this distance were cut off, as far as goods from Whiteman and Arthur's Creek and the country beyond were concerned, there would be more goods put upon the railway to save the 3 miles?—No, I would not like to say that.
414. Where is your experience and fresh section will all use the railway?—Because out of the present line you would get a proportion of the settlers who used the railway, and every fresh section you try there must increase that proportion. If you establish a station at Northcote and Preston, which now largely consists of acres of fields which have been bought for residential purposes, that increases the population, and those products will have a fresh market.

415. What will they produce?—I do not say they would produce anything, but they would become products, and that would make a fresh market. If you give the direct Fitzroy railway, it must increase the value of all that immense northern area as a producing area.

416. But as the development of goods traffic on the direct line as against the present line, would there be any advantage to the producer?—I think if you were a producer you would think it an advantage to have 3 miles of track less to travel with your produce.

417. How long does it take a train to travel 3 miles?—No man would ask you to go into this expense for the sake of that. I want to dwell upon it as a passenger line. As it is to be a traffic-running line, one line should be half—that is the Young-street line; if it is to be a passenger-running line the Head-street line should not be half. It will never pay.

418. You think only one line should be made?—Yes, and provide a convenient track for Heidelberg, for example.

419. Where would you propose to commence?—Rolling-street, across to the Young-street route. You would provide a section of Gold-street and Rolling-street, and the next station that would be John-street and Greathead-street. That would be the best possible route for the northern suburbs.

420. Looking at the thing from a business point of view, bearing in mind the great facilities in the area for transit by train, do you think that this Committee should recommend the construction of either or both these lines of railway?—I do, most emphatically.

421. How view you the competition that would be set up between the Government railways and the private?—There is plenty of room for both. Mr. Reindell said that with two lines, and yet when he was asked to construct a line he was afraid to construct what, in my opinion, is the better line of the two.

422. How do you expect the competition between road and train would come about?—It would result in a lowering of the fares—possibly so, and even if all that there is sufficient population, and the population would still further increase, to make it a payable business for both train and road,

423. Going from Northcote now by rail what do you pay?—I do not use the railway; it is too awkward. I believe the fare is 4d. return.

424. What is it by tram?—Tram will return.

425. Do you anticipate getting it any cheaper than that?—If you give me a proper route both in and out family will use the train. At present we do not use it, it is so awkward. Now, every time I ride by tram I pay for it; but if I had an annual or half-yearly or quarterly ticket I could ride in many times as it is possible.

426. Would you expect to go at a less rate than 4d. return?—No, not for one return journey; but I mean it would be less than it costs me at present for travelling.

427. When time does it occupy from Northcote to Melbourne?—By taking this tram route you cannot get a train at a time that will suit you. You cannot have an hour or an hour and a quarter for a train, but if you give us a proper clock, it will pay the Government to give us in the same facilities as the other suburban lines, you cannot expect passengers if the Government do not provide facilities.

428. If 4d. is not an excessive charge for a return journey from Melbourne to Northcote, why is it the Northcote people refuse to use the railway?—The fare is too awkward for them.

429. If it only involves two or three minutes extra, what difference does it make to them?—It might make waiting an hour, and a half for a train.

430. What time does it take from Northcote to Melbourne by train?—I think it is 30 minutes to Flinders-street.

431. Suppose you had the direct route, what would the time be on that line?—From sixteen to twenty minutes, but it is not so much a question of the time as the route. It will be a saving of time, but it is also a better route for us, a route which is of more service to us, a route that will extend our districts.

432. The present line is almost useless in regards gathering inland settlement. If the State constructed a line like that more will not be able to give facilities that they can in other facilities.

433. Is there a sentimental objection on the part of the people of Northcote to be taken round by the way?—I fear not a question of sentiment, it is a question of common sense, when you find you have to stay at home because you cannot get a train to still you, or you are in Melbourne and cannot get a train to get home again.

434. If the trains ran more frequently would that meet the case?—I think we have a right to ask for direct communication, seeing that we only ask the State for something that it would be profitable for them to construct.

435. By the Hon. B. Morrell—Looking at the blackboard, supposing Northcote had doubled the population that it has, a few years hence, and the Government got all the passengers, do you think it would be better to make a shorter line to save the waste and tearing of that traffic?—I am sure it would. I am sure the saving in the shorter line would pay for the cost of construction of the line.

436. Would it be possible to do the profitable traffic round the circh, if the population were double what it is?—No.

437. You abandon any hope of the State ever being able to make this profitable?—As a northern section.
invested in Fitzroy; and neighbourhood, and my family and myself consider ourselves largely interested in Fitzroy; so we are largely interested in the Tram Trust, and I think, instead of injuring the town interest, we will benefit it, because the more people you settle further north you take advantage of the Clifton Hill and Brunswick-Streets line of tramways. There is nothing the Tram Trust at Tram Company need be afraid of. I and members of my family own houses in Fitzroy, and the greater value you put upon Anglona, Johnson, Smith, and Brunswick streets the greater the municipal value.

44. Supposing you had a direct line there would that induce a larger population to settle down?—Yes. If you get the direct route you will have Northcote and Preston peoples; there is room for ten times the population there.

45. If they are induced to settle down in the northern suburbs, would it not rob the southern suburbs—The question is, is there room for all of us? I should be sorry to think that a work of such paramount necessity as this, when work is so badly wanted as at present, would frighten our legislators.

46. Have you any shares in the tram?—No.

47. If you had a thousand shares would you be as much in favour of direct communication by railway as you are now?—If I were a large shareholder in the Tram Company I would be more inclined still to recommend the construction of this line, believing it means the settlement of the people further north, and giving the Tram Company power to reap the benefit of the increased number of people settled further north. The Tram Company have laid down so thickly there that they want these population to pay for them. If you settle the people to the north the head of the house may go into business every day and use the railways, out it is the occasional local visitors and his wife and children visiting the neighbourhood which will keep the tram going.

48. Can you account for the action of the Tram Company?—Yes. All men will not think alike, and some men look upon it as a different fight altogether. I am giving my own opinion and giving them on oath.

49. You remember when it was first mooted to construct those tramways? would the people of Fitzroy and Collingwood have been in favour then of the tram if they thought it would injure their chance of getting a railway?—I do not think that question was ever put before them. It was a question with them of buses or tram, and they went for what they thought would be the best under the circumstances. They chose the better thing.

50. There was a great question of constructing a railway to Whittlesea direct before that time?—Yes, there has been for many years. I do not think the question has ever been put to the people so between railways and trams.

51. The question has already come up, and people have been asked why they did not oppose the construction of the tram if they wanted a railway?—I do not think it was ever thought that the construction of the tram would block the railways. I bought very largely in Northcote five years back. I would never have bought anything there at all only I felt sure ten years ago that we would have a direct line of railway there.

52. At that time, which line did they expect to get?—There seemed to be a feeling that they would get both.

53. Do you remember the agitation that the line should come in direct, and a station be built where the Exhibition is now?—That would be about 40 years ago; later still about 20 years ago, there was an agitation that both lines should be brought into what was called Smith's Swamp, near the Collingwood gardens. During Sir James Patterson's time we approached him with a strong petition, and we thought we came to an understanding with him that if we held a conference of the municipalities outside of Fitzroy and Collingwood, and agreed to support our direct route, his hands would be strengthened. We had that conference and selected the route and came back with this Fitzroy route, and got the answer against "Fitzroy and Collingwood."

54. If that had been done ten years ago you would have had a railway before now?—I quite believe that.

The motion withdrawn.

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

THURSDAY, 8TH OCTOBER, 1896.

Members present:
Mr. Cameron, in the Chair;
The Hon. D. Malville, M.L.C.; Mr. Burton;
The Hon. E. Money, M.L.C.; Mr. Green;
Mr. Young, Mr. J. S. White.

William Francis Fitzpatrick, sworn and examined.

452. By the Chairman.—What is your position?—Traffic Manager of the Victorian Railways.

453. Are you acquainted with what is called the northern suburbs?—I am.

454. From the Yarra to the Sydney-road?—Yes.

455. And from Flinders-street to here for north?—I have been over the proposed route half-a-dozen times, besides having that general knowledge of the locality which no old Melbourne resident might be supposed to possess.

456. Do you know anything farther north than that?—Only the railway lines.

457. Did you supply the information to the Railways Commissioners as to the traffic on these proposed lines?—I did.

458. Both the Collingwood and the Fitzroy?—Yes.

459. What was the population you thought would be served by those lines?—The population was taken for Fitzroy and for Collingwood; for the last, 29,000, and for Collingwood, 37,025.
40. How far did you take the population on the Fitzroy line west of Nicholson-street? I have taken the Central ward between Nicholson-street and the railway. I do not know whether that Central ward extends a little beyond Nicholson-street or not.

41. It would be so far easier for us if you can fix the streets running north and south, and then go as far west as you think proper—do you go as far as Lygon-street or Drummond-street? I have taken the Central ward bounded by Nicholson-street on the east in a northerly direction, to where it joins Freeman-street. For the West ward I take the same boundary—Nicholson-street extending from the Central ward to Victoria-parade, and on the east side about Young-street, but I may point out that my estimate was not founded on strictly-defined boundaries at all—it was founded on the population by-and-large. If you remember, I glanced at various other locations, such as Burley, East Richmond, Richmond, Albert Park, and South Melbourne, the populations of which I took, and summed the number of rail trips per annum per head. I did not define the boundaries of those places. There are some of those places where there are no people who rarely travel in trains. I took the thing by-and-large, knowing that any attempt to strictly define the limit that would be drained by a line such as this would give rise to endless disputes. I take kindred populations given as the Government Statist, and find out by our returns at the railway stations what number travelled per annum, what rate that came to, and apply it to the Eastern Suburbs to that I am only giving you the limits of the wards. That has no signification to me, because I have taken the population as given in each place.

42. We must have an idea as to the population within a given area, and must mark it by lines and bounds, so that we may find out from other sources whether it corresponds with yours?—I may tell you I got this information from the town clerks of each of those places, and checked it with the Government Statist's figures.

43. He means to say that where you get the 29,000 of the Fitzroy population it is within the area between Nicholson-street and Smith-street, on the east and west, and between Victoria-parade and the Merri Creek on the south?—Yes, practically, that is. I should like to mention the wards—North ward, Clifton ward, Centre ward, East ward, and West ward.

44. By Mr. J. S. White—You have given the whole of Fitzroy as the city?—Yes. I have given the population of each place. I found my basis on that exactly as I did on those other places I mentioned. I could not very well define it further, because I have avoided that—I have confided myself within the city limits.

45. By Mr. Chairman—Can you describe the boundary within which you give the population for the Collingwood Ward?—Yes, I took the whole of the Ward, the whole of Darling ward, the whole of Barkly ward, Abbotsford and Victoria wards. I took about half the Albert ward and about half of the North wards. Richmond.

46. Why do not you go further west than Nicholson-street; would not the people come from North Carlton?—Well, it is rather doubtful. If I begin to say that we will get so many people from this place and that, I am afraid I would make a hash of it. The only safe way to take an estimate of a suburban population is to do it in the way I have done, and it is very difficult to do it in any other way, so far as I can see.

47. But in estimating the population itself?—In making my estimate of Burley, East Richmond, Richmond, South Melbourne, and Albert Park I did not take the outlying populations, but the city populations, given by the Government Statist, in exactly the same way, so that my calculation would be uninfluenced by any outside population at all.

48. Would it be fair to take the population as far west as Rainbow-street? I probably would; but it might be said, on the other hand, that there are a lot of people in Nicholson-street who would never use the railway at all. I take the thing by-and-large, and on the other hand it might be said that some of the population in Collingwood would not travel by the Collingwood line, but by the Fitzroy. You can get all sorts of opinion about that, but by taking the population as I have, and comparing it with other similar places, I have given what, in my opinion, is a very fair estimate.

49. In looking at one side of Nicholson-street, you think the traffic would come to one side of the line and not the other; it looks a little curious?—That shows how desirable it is that an estimate should be formed independent of anything like that, and taken by-and-large, because otherwise endless disputes might arise. For instance, I might say that a man living a little east of Smith-street would go to the one line and another man might say that they might divide from the one line giving half the traffic to each other. The probability is that some residents near the Exhibition would go by tram who wanted to go into a certain part of the city.

50. Would not that apply to people on the east side of Nicholson-street?—Yes, it applies generally, but in the localities I considered it with the same thing arose.

51. You take a broader view of it than we can take from our knowledge; we can only go by the population within a certain area, and how much would drain into one street and how much into another. What is the present traffic that comes in from the Preston and Northcote and North Fitzroy lines? From the Preston line, that is to say to Preston Reservoir to and from Melbourne, for the year ending December, 1899, it was 386,690. To and from North Fitzroy line, on to the same line, 51,351. To and from various other stations, 120,000, making a total of nearly 758,000 passengers. At the number to Melbourne, two out of every three came to and left Flinders-street; the other one went to Spencer-street. That applies to the 386,690 who came to and went from Melbourne.

52. Do twice as many go from Flinders-street as from Spencer-street?—Yes.

53. In going from one side of Nicholson-street to the other, I presume you considered that the whole of these who go to Flinders-street now would go by the direct route if they had one?—I reckon that out of the 386,690 that come to and go from Melbourne we would get the whole lot, and in addition to getting that number we would get an increase of 33 per cent., owing to the increased facilities and the shorter journey of the direct route.
478. How many of those go to and from Spencer-street at present?—Yes, Spencer-street and Flinders-street.

479. How many passengers go and come on the Heidelberg line?—To and from Melbourne, 150,000; to and from Clifton Hill, 70,000; to and from Collingwood, 230,000; all other stations, 37,000—total 450,000.

480. How many of those go in Spencer-street?—About the same proportion, one in three.

481. Do you advocate the two lines?—I do.

482. Do you think it would pay the two lines as well as with one?—I think that the Collingwood line would pay from the start. The Fitzroy might pay for a little while, but would ultimately. I am not in favour of all of one line only being constructed.

483. Unless the two lines are constructed, you would oppose constraining any?—The ease to my mind is this: I am strongly in favour of both being constructed; I am not in favour of either one singly, for this reason—that although you might carry the traffic over one route at the start, there would be such a development of the northern suburbs outside the city limits of Fitzroy and Collingwood that a great increase would have to take place in the traffic service. Then there is that magnificent district from Fairfield Park to Camberwell, which can never be populated without direct connexion, and which possesses so many beauties that with a direct line it would have a large population. That would develop in a short time, and the one line that was to carry the whole traffic would have so much put on it that it could not do the business, and would have to be duplicated.

484. What is the greatest increase in the part of the country?—In the course of time.

485. If the population is decreasing, as some contend, where would it come from?—There is a temporary decrease of population, but I know this colony pretty well, having been stationed in every district, and I have the greatest faith in its future. I think that its resources are such that we will very soon get steady the depression and advance in a steady way to the position we were in some years ago before boom interfered with us. I am sure that the exodus of population we see now will cease, and many of the adventurers who have left our shores for Western Australia will come back. I see in the future a bigger population round Melbourne in the course of a few years than ever we had. I think we are bound to go on increasing.

486. Do you suppose you know that the desire is to make the Melbourne population less and the country more?—I think I mentioned on a former occasion that we occupy a unique position in connexion with population as compared with other populations in the world, yet though there has been an exodus in the city lately, that difference between town and country has been maintained. I should rather see the population in the country greater, but I fear the disproportion between the two will be maintained for some time. The only way that would be affected would be by an increase of population from outside our own borders.

487. Are you in favour of the Committee, which we do you think should be constructed?—I think the Collingwood line of the two, but I am strongly of opinion that both should be constructed.

488. In the event of only one being chosen by the Committee, which do you think?—The Collingwood.

489. In that because it has a larger population?—It has a little larger population; it would suit the Heidelberg line, and, of course, it would suit the Preston line fairly well, though a little farther than the other route, and it has also a considerable population which is not so well served by trains as Fitzroy.

490. You think then it would take the population of Preston if the line were made from the north side of the bridge by the Merri Creek railway line, and across the river a little lower down to Clifton Hill; do you think a large proportion of the passengers now travelling on that line would go by Collingwood?—I do. That route would be about half a mile longer or 53/4 than the Fitzroy, but they would naturally take that route in preference to going their present route.

491. Which would be the best for the largest number of people, for the Preston traffic to come by Collingwood, or the Fairfield Park and Heidelberg people to go by Fitzroy? The loops are provided on the north side of the river for both lines?—You refer, I presume, to the loop of the line that would connect from Fairfield Park over to Northcote proper?

492. Yes?—Yes. There is no much difference in that, whether the Heidelberg people went by the Collingwood line or the other.

493. Suppose the Fitzroy line is closed, which loop would you prefer there, the one at Reilly-street, the one on the South Norwood street, and Reilly-street, or one at Johnson and up Reilly-street, or not look at the John-street or Reilly-street proposals for one moment. If you make Fitzroy the only line, the proper course would be to make the connexion from near Fairfield Park with Northcote to take the Heidelberg traffic.

494. Which would be the best for the least expensive to work if there were only one line, the one from the Preston line at Clifton Hill or from Fairfield Park to North Fitzroy?—Are you speaking of the whole line, taking the Fitzroy?

495. Yes, there would be the least expensive if the loop were made from Preston to Collingwood, but then would be if the line went from Fairfield Park?—If you have all the traffic over the Collingwood line the expense would be increased so far as the Traffic branch is concerned by £1,250, making a total for the Traffic branch of £9,170. Whereas for the Fitzroy line under similar circumstances, the increase for the Traffic branch would be £3,950, making a total of £9,970, thus showing that so far as the Traffic branch is concerned, the Fitzroy line would be the most expensive to work.

496. That is right, but you take into calculation you make the profit on the Collingwood line, provided the two lines were constructed, of £260, and a deficit on the Fitzroy line of £5,690—that is the estimate we have got?—Yes, that is correct.

497. We asked for information as to the profit and loss on the lines if there were only one constructed—supposing there were only the Collingwood line for instance, the reply was that the profit then
would be reduced to a loss of £250. Can you inform us how there would be less profit on the line if there is only one line then if there were two? —Yes. In the first place there would be a considerable increase in the revenue from tolls and only taking the Fitzroy line, you would only have the proportion of the Collingwood population estimated by me of 29,000; now the proportion of the Collingwood population I estimate we would use the Fitzroy direct line if it were the only one is, half the Barkly ward, 3,300; half the Darling ward, 4,300; and the Loch ward, 2,800; or in total of 10,400. If you had no line on line I think that is about what you would lose—what fit Fitzroy line would take of the Collingwood.

39. By Mr. J. S. White.—Would you go to Wellington-street on the Fitzroy line? Declining ward is bounded on the north by Reilly-street, on the west by Smith-street, on the south by Johnson-street, and it runs practically to the river. I take about half of that. Then Loch ward is bounded on the north and east partly by the Merri Creek, on the west by Hoddle-street, and on the south it comes down to Reilly-street. I forgot to mention it is on the other side of the line to this Loch ward; it goes over to the Hindenburg and Plenty road right over to Smith-street in a wedge-shaped form.

40. By the Chairman.—That is hardly an explanation about the reason for the profit if there were only one line?—I have given the population that would be taken by the Fitzroy line—we are speaking of the Fitzroy line—I am telling you what proportion of Collingwood they would get.

399. If there were only the Fitzroy line you increase the deficit of that line?—It would only get 10,000 of the Collingwood population, because the rest would be so far away.

300. You calculate the loss on the two lines constructed as £6,000 on the Fitzroy; if the Collingwood line were not constructed and Fitzroy were, you would reduce that deficit by £1,000, which brings it at £5,000, isn't that because you take that number of people from the Collingwood line to the Fitzroy to make up the £5,000?—Yes.

301. When you have only one line—you suppose you have Collingwood alone—you wipe out the profit that you say would be on the Collingwood line, if there were two lines constructed, and show a loss of £250 instead of a profit of £600?—You are dealing with the total figures; I did not get that.

502. Does not it strike you as peculiar?—No.

303. The Collingwood line would not take any of the Fitzroy line?—No.

304. The worst of the thing is that, if you construct either line you do not get much of the other traffic. I will tell you how I got at that amount: I estimate half the Clifton ward—the ward down about Clifton Hill to the west of Clifton Hill, between the Fitzroy station and Clifton Hill, going down to the junction of the two lines in a southerly direction—I take half of that as 2,500. I take a quarter of the East ward. The East ward runs from Geelong-street, which borders it on the south Smith-street on the east, Johnson-street on the north, and Young-street on the west, and I take only a quarter of that; that is, 1,450 people. I take only one-sixth of the Central ward; that is bounded on the south by Johnson-street, on the west by Nicholson-street, on the north by, I think, Reilly-street, and on the east by Smith-street—I take only one-sixth of that, or 110 people; that is, a total of £6,000.

505. I find here that the interest on capital on the Collingwood line, if the two were constructed, is £7,058; if only one is constructed, and that Collingwood, the interest would be £8,385?—The interest on the Collingwood line would be £7,058, and on the Fitzroy £8,005, if built separately.

506. I find that the locomotive expenses on the Collingwood line, providing the two were constructed, is £7,437, but it would be £10,002 if there were only one line?—That I have not gone into. I have not gone into the number of the engines—that is in Mr. Woodroffe's branch.

306. By Mr. J. S. White.—You have taken the municipalities of both lines, provided both are constructed, the boundary of Nicholson-street on one side, Smith-street on the other, and Victoria-street at the Melbourne end, and the Merri Creek at the other?—Not for both lines.

307. You have taken that for the Fitzroy line?—Yes.

508. And you have gone on similar lines for Collingwood—who?—But I take in a little of Albert ward, the last ward.

509. That is, with the Fitzroy line, just over at the Scotch College?—Yes.

510. No, I do not count one on that, being so close to Melbourne?—No.

511. Do you know the distance between the two lines, the Fitzroy and Collingwood?—I do not know the exact number of miles, but I got the men to mark it.

512. Can you see Wellington-street in Collingwood on that plan?—Yes.

513. Is it the same place as where you marked the points on the plan?—Yes.

514. In that case, the Fitzroy line being the shorter of the two to Melbourne, do you think the people from here would come to the Fitzroy line?—I dare say some of them would.

515. Would they all, or were there half a mile distance coming to Melbourne?—Some of them would, and some of them would go the other way probably. It is very difficult to answer a question of that kind, because, as the distance to Melbourne would be about the same and the fare the same, I think myself that a good many would go to the Collingwood line.

516. From Wellington-street on. Yes.

517. Do not people usually make towards the place they are going to, particularly with half-a-mile less railway?—I do not think the men altogether apply. A man has the particular station he will go to, and is not particular about a few yards. I suppose it would take only five minutes' walk from either line. It is eleven minutes' ordinary walk from one line to the other just at that point. There are two railway stations—the nearest railway station there would be Geelong-street. It is difficult to say—both Johnson and Geelong streets would meet the population of Wellington-street in the thickest part. On the other hand, Collingwood would have to meet a portion of the population and Victoria parade would have to race the other; but it is probable that, after the line was open, a little platform would have to be put at the Town Hall, Collingwood, so as to sort that difficulty. Although it is only a short distance from Collingwood proper, I have no doubt that something of that kind would be done. Then it would be simply a matter of choice; in fact, a man would have his mind fixed by conflicting conditions as to which station he would travel from, because he would have a choice of four.

518. Have you not taken return for municipal purposes, not railway purposes?—I was careful not to raise that question at all, the differences of boundaries, because of the difficulties that always attend
them. I took South Melbourne, Albert Park, Burnley, East Richmond, and Richmond; they have all tram competition, and I reckon on that.

319. But in this instance there is a very densely populated portion of Collingwood between Smith-street and Wellington-street, and according to the plan there is only one station to be at Victoria-street on the Collingwood line?—Yes, and the next one is Collingwood itself, and I have told you there may be a platform at the Town Hall.

320. Do you not think that Fitzroy is entitled to that traffic to Wellington-street, for the reason that they have an extra station at the narrow cross streets going leading towards Melbourne—do you not think the people living in the centre between Victoria and Johnson streets will actually go there?—If I lived in Smith-street I should go there. I do not say how the whole of the traffic would go. I had to take my estimate on the whole population, and there is no doubt if you came to cross-examine me on both lines I could have to state that same little part of that population might go to one side or the other; but those remarks will apply equally to Fitzroy.

321. Why?—Because I might not use the other hand that there are some of the population I have included in the Fitzroy estimate that might not use the Fitzroy line at all.

322. And we use the Collingwood line?—Quite so; and there are people in portions of Albert Park who do not use the railway.

323. You are giving us two lines how—if we construct only one line you say the traffic of that will come below Wellington-street to Fitzroy?—There is a great failing-off in the traffic if you construct only one line. If you take the Collingwood line, the further you come west from that the fewer passengers you get. With two lines there is another line to intercept and catch the strong of passengers. Without another line there will be nothing but the trams to catch them.

324. You gave 10,000 as the number of Collingwood inhabitants who would come to Fitzroy—are all those from that point on the plan living in the area between Smith-street and that point?—There is a population of 6,586 in that thickly populated place.

325. You were asked how far you would go down if there were only the Fitzroy line, and you went down a considerable distance towards the Collingwood station from Wellington-street; if you take that line north and south there are more inhabitants between that portion of Smith-street than there are below it towards the river?—They have nothing like the same facilities from the river to get to Melbourne, and therefore the population is thinner.

326. The trams run down to the river?—They have not the same as Fitzroy proper.

327. In giving an estimate of the Collingwood and Fitzroy lines you said that Fitzroy is entitled to the traffic you have given to Collingwood between Wellington and Smith streets, because the traffic will come in that direction and not the other?—I went over the ground and thought to myself that it would be a very wise man indeed who could say how many would go either one side or the other there, and it seemed to me that the only safe way to go on was to take the course that I took in judging of the population as a whole, and making an estimate thereof—of course that is liable to little variations that really do not affect the point at all, because I did not discriminate in that way so as to the other places that I took for the purposes of illustration.

328. You are aware that Albert Park and South Melbourne have not the same facilities as to trams and that some portions go to Albert Park to the South?—Yes.

329. Therefore your traffic must be much larger in the southern lines?—No; the trams do better there with the same than they do at East Richmond and Burnley. It is somewhat singular that the amount—(14) comes out for East Richmond, Richmond, Burley, and the Preston line, South Yarra, Albert Park, and South Melbourne, and they all vary in the number per head; but they all come out at 14, which shows that the comparison is fair.

330. Do you take that calculation per mileage?—I take the revenue.

331. What about the mileage?—One average mileage on the solatium lines travelled is about 4.5: and that is, taking the suburbs as a whole, and that gives us an average fare of about 2s. 6d., the average amount per mile being 3s. 6d., so that the average mileage, taking those places all found, would be pretty well 2 miles.

332. Have you calculated the mileage for a portion of South Melbourne and the other stations away to the north?—I took the business at South Melbourne separately, and also at the other places.

333. Taking North Fitzroy or Preston, what would you have to pay them in proportion to the mileage in comparison with South Melbourne?—That is raising another question. If we charged the regular fares that are charged to similar places it would come to—first single, 3d.; second single, 3d.; first return, 6d.; and second return, 6d.; but I am not calculating it on that. I would not, at any rate, be less than 2d. each way, so that 1d. each way in a fair estimate.

334. What is the fare to Coburg?—Coburg is exceptionally dear with—it gets about the same fare.

335. Why is it exceptionally dear with?—Because there is very keen tram and cab competition out as far as Moreland. Those lines have to come a roundabout way to Flinders-street, so it is right and proper that they should be specially dealt with. If we had a direct mileage to the place there would be no particular competition grew there.

336. Coburg is 6 miles?—Yes. The actual running distance from Spencer-street is 5½ miles, and the actual distance is 6½ miles from Spencer-street.

337. By the Hon. D. McNeil.—You charge the same for all the intermediate stations on the line?—Yes.

338. So that you charge the same for one mile as for five?—Yes.

339. By Mr. C. S. White.—You say the reason the fares were reduced was the competition?—Yes.

340. Is the competition there now as there will be with the trams if you construct the Flinders line?—Yes.

341. Will not the competition be much greater in Fitzroy?—I do not think the competition could be greater than it is about Brunswick; what with the cars that charge a 2d. fare, and the trams that give a return fare for 3d., and charge 2d. each way the rest of the day. I went up to 2½ n. and charge 2d. each way for the sake of argument, that the train rates would be brought down if we build this line, and that the rates may charge would be somewhat the same, but our rates will be lower. If that took place we would not
charge the Fitzroy town the usual fare charged everywhere, we would have to bring that rate down; but what I said was, that it is no likelihood it would come to less than the 13d. which I have allowed. In connexion with the Cohorn line, if that went straight into Melbourne the fares would not be noticeable; it is because they have to go round.

542. It is 4 miles from the Post Office to Morland direct!—We would charge a little more for that, but even then, as we started with a lower fare we would scarcely come up to the full fare charged generally from Coburg to this Fitzroy line, we would have to bring our rates down, but we would not go below 13d. I have reckoned on that; then the people would have a very marked facility of quick transit, which is a very great factor in the matter. It has been found by experience that where you have either train service alone or tram service alone, when you add to the travelling facilities you increase the number of people who travel. We cannot present that inducement in connexion with the Cohorn line to anything like the same extent as we could in connexion with the Fitzroy line, therefore we might hope to do better on the latter for that reason.

543. Do you expect to carry the passengers to Northcote for the same fare as to Fitzroy?—They have very low fares on the Preston line, fares that are too low outside the tram competition, and we are now looking over the fares generally, and I dare say something will be done to remedy that anomaly, but we would have to deal with that exceptionally as far as Middle Northcote.

544. In doing that would not you take the people who now live in Fitzroy who are paying big rents for houses with small yards?—We would not take them for the same fare; we would make the Fitzroy a little less.

545. Why make an exception with them any more than the Flemington-bridge?—Because, as I have stated, there is very keen competition. I do not know that we would do so, but I anticipate we would be forced to.

546. By the Hon. D. McVille.—Do you know how much you have gained since 1865 on the Coborn line?—I have to those figures lowering these figures with the exception of 1880, but there has been a considerable increase, because before we reduced the fares we had nobody. It has enormously increased.

547. Is it a fact that the Department, by this method on that line, have more than doubled their income, excluding the assistance for passengers?—I should like to see the report before replying to that.

548. Will you send in the difference in the first three years, 1890 to 1893, with the high fares up to November. Then take the next three years and see the result to the Department?—I will send an estimate of that for one year to show it.

549. By Mr. Pascoe.—Let us have the working expenses also?—A different thing comes in there, because the working expenses three or four years ago were altogether out of the question, and they have been reduced enormously. That has not been caused by the traffic. We have a greatly increased traffic with much less working expenses.

550. The cost of earning the money is an important factor in the problem?—The line was extravagantly manned three or four years ago. It had too much on it, and now it does a very much larger business with a much less staff, so it has not been influenced by the business, but by retrenchment.

551. What was the number of trains run then and the number now?—That is about the same.

552. By Mr. J. S. White.—Would you also give us the St. Kilda line for the same period?—Yes.

553. By Mr. Harris.—Is that increase of the traffic that has been alluded to due to the reduction in fares or partly from other causes, and, if so, what?—I have my own opinion about that, and I may say that the depression, in the Brunswick locality, for instance, has been very great. A lot of poor people have left, and that left houses empty. I have no doubt that special fares to the places caused a larger number of people to go and live there than would have done but no such a large number would have gone anywhere to places where very good houses were to be had for almost next to nothing.

554. By Mr. J. S. White.—You said you had great faith in the prosperity of the colony, that in a short time it will come back to what it was a few years ago?—I think so.

555. In your opinion, if we had only our own resources for the last twenty years, should we have had the good times we had ten years ago. What I mean is this: We borrowed £20,000,000 of money and spent it in railways, which railways are now constructed and no likelihood of our constructing much more for some time, then how are the times going to improve with no borrowed money coming in?—The borrowing is a very difficult matter for no do to with. I have no doubt a lot of money would have been spent all over the colony, but I do know that there is a vast territory well watered by railways waiting for cultivation, waiting free people to put on the soil, and I look at the map and I see the railways in every direction, and say, "Where is the population?". Well, I think we will make normal progress in future. We will not lack in so much on borrowed capital, and gradually the colony will receive an accession to its population; and I am sure that most of those who have gone to Western Australia will come back, and I have no doubt, from what I have heard of the place, a great many will come back with fresh wealth. I also know that there is no Victorian who leaves the colony who does not humour to come back. Victoria’s climate is so fine, its soil is first-class, and the distances are easy, and everything points to a splendid future for the colony. Its seasons are directly opposite to those of thickly populated Europe, and with the improvement in refrigeration, I see a big future before this colony. I am as sure of it as of anything in this world.

556. Although we have railways through all our territory, why are our farmers leaving for New South Wales?—Of course New South Wales has given some remarkable advantages to settlers of late, and the town of Geelong has a lot of virgin soil in Riverina and the northern parts that has never been cultivated before, and the inducements are so great as to cause Victorian people who have worked out their land to clear out to fresh fields and partners new, hoping that with the inducements held out by the Government and the fertile virgin land that they will be able to offset the seasons, and, if so, they are sure of a very good price for their grain in a colony that grows it with difficulty, excepting in the south; their hopes up to the present have not been realized.

557. Have you not any quantity of virgin soil here with railway communication right through the estate?—I know that we have such virgin soil any way; I could not say at the time those people started to go. The development of the colonies is the only matter of a very few years. Most of our wheat lands have been cultivated for many years. While, no doubt they can grow a good deal more, the land round Horsham wants a rest, and must have it.
558. Then if our land is worked out, it will be some years before it comes back!—You have the virgin soil in one place, and land cultivated for some time in another, but it is probable that a barren year or two may. New South Wales will send these fellows back again. The only place where they have been doing well is about Riverina, where they have had a special rainfall peculiar to the Colman district, where they have the most farmers.

559. If we had similar laws to give encouragement and make it easier for the people to get on to the land, you think we should have more population than New South Wales?—That is a question I would rather not answer. I can only generally say that anything that would facilitate putting the people on the land I am heartily in favour of.

560. By Mr. Burton.—In the papers before me I find that your Department, the Commissioners and others, have given an opinion about it, and make no allowance for any traffic from goods. In your opinion, would either of those lines or both of them have any effect in stimulating production and increasing the traffic in goods on the lines beyond Preston, and so on?—No, not the slightest, as far as I can see.

561. It has been said by some of the witnesses that it would increase the production on existing lines that are now connected in a roundabout way with Melbourne.—I do not think it would. I wish to explain. You have a goods station at Collingwood, it is pretty well half-way, and a goods station at Fitzroy, and they fairly well serve the whole of that locality; and I do not think that it would pay the Railway Department to give any greater facility on either of those lines; I think that the facility given at Fitzroy and Collingwood is as good as the district really requires. Any further facility would only, as it were, accentuate our traffic.

562. As the line from Preston to Whittlesea through agricultural and horticultural country, do you imagine that if this more direct line were constructed it would encourage people to go in for more horticulture?—We would not bring the traffic that way.

563. Then is the influence on the goods?—Not in the least.

564. Mr. Bentall estimates that there would be £10,000 from miscellaneous goods traffic!—I do not know what he means by “miscellaneous,” but as far as goods traffic is concerned I would give nothing for the line.

565. Your opinion is that we should altogether depend on the suburban passenger traffic and nothing else?—That is all.

566. You would ask the Committee to discard any calculation or any influence as to goods?—As traffic manager I have not made any allowance for goods, and I do not think any allowance should be made.

567. Does the line now going round by Royal Park and Spencer-street, connecting with Preston and Whittlesea, give those people all the facilities they need for the transit of their fruit and goods?—Yes. They are charged the actual distance. Of course the difficulty is that any places within, say, 20 miles of Melbourne do not send their stuff by rail as a rule—their vegetables and fruit. Say you are an orchardist or a vegetable grower; you send up your vehicle and you might as well take it right 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 Mandalong and this Whittlesea line where fruit and vegetables are grown, we get very little traffic. They drive right into the market.

568. Having in view that there is likely to be a large export trade in fruit, might it not develop?—If we did develop that, it would not make any difference to those people whether they came the direct line or not, because they would be only charged the rates for the direct line.

569. Would the time in transit be a serious thing in the conveyance of the fruit?—So little it is not worth mentioning.

570. There would be no difference in the charge if the new lines were made by carrying them round the long way?—No, we would charge them the direct mileage.

571. Would it be a greater charge to the people?—No.

572. Would the greater distance to carry injure the fruit?—No.

573. Can you see no advantage to the producers in the construction of these two lines?—Not the slightest.

574. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Those two proposals of yours mean to put you on the same level as the trans. Collingwood and Fitzroy are about 2½ miles from the city of Melbourne. You will be on the same level as to distance as the trans?—Yes.

575. You will be exactly on a level with the trans if you get those two proposals carried out?—Yes.

576. By that you will save the whole of the circle in tear and wear and time of the passenges?—Yes.

577. Can you tell us what the State loses by that tremendous circumnavigation of taking people round by Spencer-street and Flinders-street?—I have not the figures with me—taking the whole northern suburban lines.

578. I mean the entire circle, what you lose from North Fitzroy to Flinders-street!—I cannot say about the Coburg line. Take it from Royal Park, going on taking the Preston line and all the other lines right out to, say, half-way between Fairfield Park and Camberwell on the Outer Circle, we are paying over £25,000 a year interest there, and I do not think we are making working expenses.

579. Say what are we losing by working expenses in that extra bend with this particular traffic which you are proposing to serve in a new way?—I cannot give that; I will send it in. 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.

580. If you make 4 miles and 99 claims more you complete your recommendation, and you think the Department will get the trade?—Yes.

581. You will save this loss!—I think we will gradually wipe it out.

582. You are pretty well able now to estimate what the tram connection means in other districts, and can estimate what it will be on this Collingwood and Fitzroy line?—Yes.

583. You can make a pretty safe estimate as to your own income from those two lines if you construct both?—Yes, and I might use a further illustration to show that the estimate I have made is not too great. The Port Melbourne line, as you all know, has tram competition between the railway and its
population, so that if there is any line that ought to have been taken up I should say it is that one would be the only one that could be run by the train from the railway, yet we get over £5,000 a mile from passenger traffic. Besides this we get the incoming mails, and this estimate was taken last year when the shipping business was very small indeed. If you look at the mileage to be served at the Collingwood line, my estimate is £6,500 a mile, and the Fitzroy is only £4,500 a mile.

354. Do you think your estimate is fairly correct?—Yes.

355. You are not calculating the back country?—I am not calculating any increase on it.

356. Then if there is an enormous passenger traffic developed there?—I only know as far as Whitsunday.

357. You have put it in any way exaggerated your position as to this Fitzroy line?—I have rigidly kept low and profoundly.

358. Relatively per mile on the basis of the population, what will it yield?—About £6,000 for the Collingwood, and £4,500 for the Fitzroy.

359. Both are the same distance from Melbourne. Fitzroy has an assessment of £225,399, and Collingwood £171,399:—That estimate I gave was for Fitzroy and the Collingwood alone respectively, not for anything that may come from other lines.

360. You are making the one greater than the other, and yet, if you look at the areas you will see they are both the same distance, and Fitzroy has a higher annual assessment. The population of the entire of Collingwood is slightly more than Fitzroy?—The population is 8,000 more. I get the population of Fitzroy as 20,000, and Collingwood 27,000. New, as the train competition is heavier in Fitzroy than in Collingwood, I take in Fitzroy only 50 journeys per head of population, whereas I take 58 to Collingwood.

361. 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.

362. From Prince's-bridge, east side, to the first station on the Fitzroy line going to Fitzroy?—Grey-street is 58 chains, and it would take two minutes. The next station—Gertrude-street—1 mile 10 chains, four minutes; Johnston-street, 1 mile 26 chains, six minutes.

363. 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.

364. Are you able to maintain that solely?—Certainly.

365. Could you increase that?—No; that is taking the average speed. I will show you on what it is founded. The average speed on the St. Kilda line, including stops, is 16 miles an hour, and between stations 18 miles; Brighton line, 18 miles and 20 miles; Camberwell, 13 miles and 18 miles; Fitzroy proposed line, 15 miles and 18 miles; Collingwood, 15 miles and 18 miles; the Melbourne Elevated, 12 miles and 15 miles. I got in that last because that is one of the biggest and most important suburban systems in the world.

366. Compare these figures with your present traffic round the circle, and show the gains?—From North Fitzroy and Nicholson-street to the G.P.O., 22 minutes; from the same locality through Brunswick-street, 27 minutes; from Clifton Hill to the G.P.O. via Smith-street, 27 minutes; from Collingwood and Johnston-street, 23 minutes; and the train from its terminus at Victoria-street, 25 minutes; and at Bridge- road, about 25 minutes. That is the train time.

367. What are you being by this long drag of 20 to 26 minutes, and in wear and tear on the railway?—Roughly speaking, the Department's loss on the northern suburban lines is somewhere about £50,000 per annum; that is including everything.

368. Give it without the interest?—I will get that for you.

369. I want to get at what you will absolutely save by your new construction?—I will supply that.

370. Tell also the working expenses of the two lines as you propose them now, and see how they will show alongside the working expenses of the present circle?—As the result can only be anticipatory, it would be very difficult to do that.

371. You have estimated your working expenses on the two proposals?—Yes. I will get that.

372. Now to the mileage?—The time at present occupied by trains to run from Clifton Hill and Collingwood to Melbourne is 23 and 25 minutes respectively. The direct line will reduce it for Heidelberg passengers from 48 to 29 minutes. I will give the other line. The time taken at present by trains from the Preston lines between North Fitzroy and Flanders-street is 25 minutes, and the direct line will reduce it to eight minutes from Fitzroy, and ten minutes from North Fitzroy.

373. And you will have two new stations coming towards Grey-street?—Fitzroy will be a passenger station.

374. So practically, you bring those stations right into the heart of the city?—To Flanders-street.

375. Will there be anything saved in management of these stations, getting them all at Prince's-bridge?—Yes. That means we have a central station at Flanders-street. I have given you the terminal charges for that.

376. About your statistics, I am puzzled at this—go to your gathering ground at Smith-street; if you look at the map, Smith-street is 17 chains from Johnston-street on the Fitzroy line, and 44 chains from Johnston-street on the Collingwood line. Population on the east side of Smith-street is credited to the Collingwood line, and on the west side of Smith-street to the Fitzroy line?—Yes.

377. Do you understand how that comes about—person, therefore, standing at the corner of Johnston and Smith streets, just inside the Collingwood boundary, can get to the end of the dock at Prince's-bridge station by way of the Fitzroy line in 1 mile 67 chains. He walks 17 chains to the station, and goes by rail in 1 mile 20 chains: the total he does in it is 1 mile 67 chains?—Yes.

378. By way of the Collingwood line you have to travel 2 miles 72 chains, standing where I say that is to Johnston-street, Collingwood, 44 chains, and then by 2 miles 26 chains, or altogether 2 miles 98 chains, if you are creating them to the wrong status?—That same proposal was received by Mr. White, and I pointed out that I did not lend myself to any definition as to exactly where they would go. I took the population of each piece, and I said it was likely, with the development of the traffic, we would have to put a station near the Town Hall, Collingwood.
609. In making out these estimates to show that one line will pay and the other will have a loss, it is necessary that the Committee understand how you bring those figures out; one way I mark 5 claims will be saved by a man in Collingwood using the Fitzroy line. That would contain 6,596 people, and it is only a question of those that would use the Collingwood street station by preference. That might be said all along from Ballarat-street to the Melbourne side of Victoria-plate. There are no points in which we doubt, Fitzroy might gain a little on Collingwood, but it is impossible to draw a line and say the people as one particular locality will go this way or the other way.

610. You necessarily drive the Committee to examine the basis on which you bring this out.

Quite so.

611. So this means to land us in a fallacy; the credit to Collingwood is an absurdity: if a man by going into Fitzroy will save 1 mile 5 claims—Can you have taken the population of the Collingwood city and the Fitzroy city, and have also taken the population of Brunswick, East Richmond, Richmond, Albert Park, and South Melbourne, and in taking those latter I have not taken into account any definitions of boundary where people might not come to a railway? I have taken it by-and-large. If I applied the same process of reasoning that you have adopted as to the Fitzroy line, I might say, taking the Central ward, which consists of 6,255 population, there may be some of those who will not use the rail at all. That is in Fitzroy.

612. If we were to go by these figures we are in a dilemma. I cannot conceive a man going 1 mile 5 claims out of his way? I allow that hiatus, but still I say my figures are correct.

613. If the figures are to apply on the net result of the two lines' working, which is more what we desire to inquire into, the dividing the profit or loss is very difficult;—It is. I think that because of that difficulty.

614. Wellington-street is about mid-way between the two proposed lines. A person at the corner of Wellington-street and Johnston-street would get to Prince' s bridge by Johnston-street, in 2 miles 4 claims—he would have to walk 31 claims to the station and take by mile 1 mile 50 claims, total, 2 miles 1 claim. If he went by Johnston-street, Collingwood, he would have to travel 2 miles 5 claims, that is he would have to walk to Collingwood 30 claims, and by 2 miles 25 claims, total, 2 miles 55 claims.—That is what Mr. White asked me.

615. You say the two lines taken together will have that result without dividing it;—I have taken the population of each place, and I have made this estimate on the population of similar places, and it seems to me to be a fair one. I admit that what you say about Wellington-street is true; that is to say, that it is probable that part of the population about there would go to the Johnston-street station, but that little difficulty has escaped us, and it has been thought that if the gauge were the same, we would put a platform near the Town Hall on the Collingwood line after that line was built, after proving the traffic; then that disability would be much reduced.

616. You now say you would use a motor from the Royal Park to develop the trade west of North Fitzroy?—Yes.

617. Have you credited that in the account?—Yes. We have taken the present traffic from the Preston line to Flinders-street, Spencer-street to North Melbourne, which we reckon would be carried over to Preston new line, 58,000, and we reckon it at 1d.,—that comes to £3,600. We think it would be a fair thing to say that when those people get a direct line straight into Melbourne there would be no increase of about 25 per cent. in a short time, almost from the start I think, and that gives £1,031. Now, as a set-off against that, of course this is business that is taken from an existing line, there will be a saving of train unladen to the existing line of about 60,000 miles, which, at 1s. 6d., a mile, comes out at £4,000; that is the mileage from North Melbourne to Melbourne. Then this is after allowing for a motor service between North Fitzroy and Royal Park of 24 trains a day connecting North Fitzroy with the Collingwood lines at Royal Park, so that anybody who wants to travel from the Collingwood line to the Fitzroy line and Collingwood, or vice versa, may have the means of doing so. I think three train miles equal to two ordinary train miles—taking 1s. 6d. a mile, and the motor miles 10l., and I give that as a set-off which just about balances it.

618. In this proposal of 4 miles 92 claims will it complete the whole of the suburban system as far as you know; is there anything in prospect unaccomplished?—No; I should say if those lines were built the whole of the suburban lines that are required in our time will have been constructed.

619. Is there anything further proposed?—I am not aware of anything.

620. Can you from memory tell us how much you lost by the trains coming into competition with you in the year they first came into competition with you on the southern side?—I cannot tell you that.

621. Do you consider you could ever develop a payable traffic on such lines as you work them at present, from Flinders-street to North Melbourne by way of Royal Park?—No, never.

622. Your only hope of making it payable is those two lines?—That is all.

623. By Mr. Harris.—Could one line be made to serve both Collingwood and Fitzroy and the country beyond with a duplication to fellow should traffic warrant it?—The line could be made, but, of course, that would mean if you were to provide for the future that the line should be duplicated, and I am quite sure that whichever line you built in that way you would have ultimately to build the other line, and then you would regret that so much expenditure had taken place on one line.

624. If one line only were made, and put in a position to meet the Collingwood and Fitzroy traffic and the country beyond, and the traffic were found too great for it, would it interfere very materially with the building of the second line?—Do you mean either the present route for the Fitzroy line to answer both, or the Collingwood to answer both?

625. I meant the Collingwood or Fitzroy line; if either were constructed and the traffic were found too great for the one would the fact of trying to meet both localities interfere materially with the construction of a future line?—I do not understand what line you mean.

626. By the Chairman.—The question is, my lord, there is a line for Flinders-street and one for Young's street to suit both, was it constructed at South Melbourne, would it alternate as a future and the construction of another line?—I think it would make a mess of the whole thing. So far as the Fitzroy part is concerned it would be too far from the centre and westward to adjoining the city of Melbourne.
637. By Mr. Harris.—Would anything be practically saved by making one line only?—Such as that half-way between?

638. Yes?—No; I think you would have the same working expenses, and you put it out of the power of the district ever to have anything more except at a much cost.

639. You are aware that Parliament has authorized the sale of the Yarra Bend and Kew Asylum reserves. If the Collingwood line were made what extra value would it give to those reserves?—This matter engaged my attention, and I think it would give a very considerable value to those reserves, as they would be within very easy distance of the railway line with a direct route into Melbourne.

640. Would it increase them one-third or one-half?—I cannot say the amount, but I know it would largely increase it.

641. If only the Fitzroy connexion were made would that cause the value of the reserves to rise?—It would, but in a very much lessened degree as compared with the Collingwood.

642. Would the Fitzroy connexion only be made, how would the existing Collingwood route stand for traffic?—That is only to Collingwood station?

643. Yes?—I do not think it would affect it one way or the other so far as the railway traffic is concerned, but you would take away all the Heidelberg traffic right through the line to Fitzroy, and you would only get the number of passengers who wanted to do business in Collingwood itself; with Collingwood locally it would not affect the situation.

644. Is this loop line from Northcote practically the completion of the Outer Circle line?—Yes; it would be, whether you take it that way or right through from Collingwood into Melbourne.

645. Would it not be of use in the event of a second line being made further on?—It would practically be wasted, in my opinion, if you built a second line afterwards.

646. Would the loop line from Northcote to Clifton Hill be of any use if the construction of the Fitzroy line followed the construction of the Collingwood line?—That again would be considerably wasteful. The two are exactly on a par. If you constructed the other line it would be too much line of no use.

647. On what gradient did you base your cost of working on the Collingwood line?—The rolling grade is 1 in 94.

648. Is that what the estimate was based on?—Yes.

649. Is there not a grade of 1 in 50 between Collingwood and Clifton Hill?—There may be. Of course, I was prepared to meet with grades of 1 in 50.

650. If there is a grade of 1 in 50 between Collingwood and Clifton Hill will that not alter your estimates of the cost of working?—No.

651. Is there not a grade of 1 in 50 in the proposed loop line from Clifton Hill to Northcote?—There may be.

652. Suppose both these lines were constructed what portion of the train traffic do you expect to catch?—I expect it to increase the number of passengers for that traffic—That is, the traffic that will arise naturally in the district by the increased facilities and what I get from the trains, I make it that the railway will get about 50 per head of the population, which will reduce the trains to a certain extent, what extent I cannot say, but experience teaches that where you have a train service or a train service alone in a thickly populated district and where you add either the one or the other you largely increase the travelling of the public. The more convenient the more they travel—indeed to an extraordinary extent. That is how I reckon to get the 50.

653. By Mr. Coeves.—You said a saving would be made by connecting those two lines, the Fitzroy and Collingwood, with regard to the Outer Circle lines?—I do not quite understand.

654. You said there was a loss of about £96,000 on the north railway lines and Outer Circle?—I was reckoning from Royal Park.

655. Seeing you would not bring any goods at all on the Collingwood or Fitzroy lines, would what you expect to make to entirely due to passenger traffic?—Entirely. I have not reckoned any prospective traffic whatever from the re-opening of the Fairfield Park line. I have left that question alone. The district is now very thinly populated, but all I can say is that I think it is a fair assumption that with those direct lines a very pretty district is made accessible, which must increase in population largely, and that is the whole basis to the future of those lines, and I have not taken it into account at all.

656. You said, in answer to Mr. Burton, that all the goods would go round, as at present, by Spencer-street?—Yes.

657. Consequently the proposed stations on either of those two routes would not provide for goods?—Yes, the Fitzroy existing and the Collingwood existing do so.

658. You said that the two existing terminal gave all the outlet required for goods for the district?—Yes.

659. Suppose that both lines were constructed would it cost much to alter the stations so as to receive goods traffic if desired?—It would cost a great deal of money. The goods is not worth the candle.

660. As to the rates that you are going to charge; what would it be to Fitzroy or Collingwood, the lowest?—I cannot say that. What I say is that I calculate that we would make 1½. I would be for the Commissioner to say what rates he would charge. I could not give any idea of that; that would depend on circumstances that will arise at the time.

661. What you based your calculation on is making the 1½ profit on each traffic?—No, the gross receipt.

662. Would you make the distinction of first and second class?—I take the average rate altogether at 1½. The average rate for second class would be less than that; the first would be more.

663. You spoke about your being able to compete with the trains by reason of the fact that you travel so much more quickly than the trains?—Yes.

664. Do you think that a person started in Collingwood or Fitzroy about half-way between, within five minutes of any station in that area, if he had to go to the Post Office in Melbourne, you would walk for five minutes, and then wait for a train for several minutes, and when he arrived in Flanders-street walk to the Post Office?—He would go through all that and take practically the same time and travel by the train in preference to the train?—I think so, because it would be cheaper.
655. You depend on your cheapness!—Desirably, I can show you how materially that question affects the whole situation. Take South Yarra as an illustration. The daily tickets to there are—first single, 5d.; second single, 2½d.; first return, 4½d.; second return, 3½d.; monthly, first class, 9s.; second class, 7s.; quarterly, first class, 24s. 6d.; second class, 19s.; half-yearly, first class, 46s. 6d.; second class, 46s.; yearly, first class, 70s. 6d. Now I will give you the tram fares—daily return, 6d., monthly, 13s.; quarterly, 29s.; half-yearly, 78s.; yearly, 15s.

656. What are they based on—travelling once a day?—Yes; and our tickets enable people to travel as often as they like with periodicals.

657. Assuming the tram company decided to issue periodical tickets on the same basis as the railway, would that affect the question seriously?—It would to some extent. I do not like to express an opinion on what the tram company might or should do, but judging from the number of people who travel now and the returns, it appears to me that if they issued periodical tickets they would have to so largely increase their expenses as to make it an unprofitable business. You see our rails, except in the very busy times, are so well that they cannot take a great many more without increasing working expenses, while the tram company would have to increase the number of trams, and every tram means a couple of men. Even supposing that the tram company did go in for periodical fares, then of course we would go in for lower periodical fares. We would still retain our relative positions. The general public would be benefited and the tram and railway would be pretty rough. Whichever had the largest purse would win.

658. Mr. J. W. H.:—Is that good policy?—No.

659. Mr. C.:—In your explanation as to estimating from Burley and so on, do you do it this way: Say Burley has 10,000 population, you suppose this 2,000 people travel?—I take that 10,000 and reckon that every individual of that population travels from that place 67 times a year by rail.

660. Mr. Conroy:—In estimating that, you compare with that 57 from Richmond, East Richmond, and Burley, 45 from South Melbourne and Albert Park?—I have taken those as a proper admixture of rich and poor; Richmond and South Melbourne are the home of the working man. I have put in Albert Park so as to leave the whole lot.

661. In arriving at that population did you take any particular radius round a station?—I went a clerk to the Government Statist and got the figures, and looked at the Statist's returns and saw those figures were what he gives, and then I did not look at a single place with a view to see how the boundary affected it at all.

662. How do you get at the population?—It is not the population from the Government Statist.

663. Take Albert Park—unless you know where the boundaries are it is hard to apply it?—Roughly speaking I do know what that is, but a lot of Albert Park would not travel by rail. I took those places as served by trams and somewhat similar to Collingwood and Fitzroy, and reckoned that there are a lot of people in those places that do not travel at all, and the same will happen on the Collingwood and Fitzroy.

664. Take Albert Park. How far down the line do you go to St. Kilda and how far this way and how far east and west?—I took the population sworn by the Government Statist and took the Albert Park returns, and I am confident that I have underestimated it, because there is a lot of that population towards St. Kilda-road that I know from my observation walk in.

665. And on the St. Kilda-road and towards Melbourne?—Yes; and when I took the Albert Park returns at the station, I thought it was a very fair thing. That gives a fair margin for people to use other means of travelling, either trams or walking. If I went to Albert Park with you and we surveyed the place, I could increase my figures.

666. Which did you take in estimating Collingwood or Fitzroy?—In calculating Collingwood, I reckoned that there would be less competition than with Fitzroy, and therefore I gave Collingwood the credit of 30 and Fitzroy only 30.

667. Do you know the scheme that was before the old Railways Committee—Million's scheme?—I remember seeing that scheme some considerable time ago.

668. It starts at Spencer-street, goes along Lonsdale-street to the General Post Office, then has a station at the Model Schools, then branches off down Victoria-pavement to Hoddle-street, and along Hoddle-street, and makes a connexion with the Collingwood line. Then from the Model Schools again he goes down Nicholson-street to Rolly-street, and then on to the Fitzroy line. The intention is that there is an extension on these two lines—that the two routes would be made for the cost of one of the other?—I remember that scheme very well. Melbourne is one of the finest cities south of the line; it has got beautiful broad streets that are in no way disfigured, and I think it would be a very grievous mistake to go and put a "puffing Billy" down through those streets and spoil them. There would be sufficient disfigurement as it is by bringing the northern suburbs lines along the routes chosen, but I believe those routes are chosen to do the least amount of mischief in that respect. I would not look at Million's scheme if it were to be constructed for nothing. I think in future years it would be raised up as a disengagement.

669. Would not a central station above the General Post Office command the principal centre of Melbourne?—I do not think so. The existence of the present central stations at Flinders-street and Flinders' bridge has helped to develop that part of the city, which, from a business point of view, is really the heart of the city. You go from Flinders-street into the busy life of the city's life, and I think Flinders-street is admirably suited for the requirements of Melbourne.

670. You do not think that trafficgate too much congested there?—No. At Flinders-street it is only a question of money to provide accommodation for an enormous population.

671. Is there a working population between Collingwood and Fitzroy that would go to the north of the Post Office and towards Carlton?—would there be a considerable traffic headed there?—I think so.

672. Do you think that the fact of coming into Spencer-street again would not the country traveller—or people going up country?—No, we would agree bring country people to a place like that.

673. Would this scheme of Million's be more suitable for the country visitors from beyond Collingwood and Fitzroy in reason of its tapping Spencer-street than if it went round by Flinders-street?—They would come into Flinders-street naturally, and they would get such an easy transfer there by a penny tram or by train that it would be just as handy for them to come that way.
675. By the Chairman.—You make no allowance for the passengers from the outside districts beyond Northeast.—Yes, I have reckoned the passengers on the Preston and Whitelock line. It is a very small item, what Preston towns to North Fitzroy from the Whitelock line and vice versa; it is 11,428. Assume that 66 cent. of those passengers will travel to the terminus at 1/4, that amounts to only £43.

676. Did you make allowance for what number would go to the country beyond Heidelberg?—No.

677. Do you have the population beyond Heidelberg, the three shires?—I have the populations.

678. I do not know the country beyond Whitelock, but I have seen the country many times beyond Heidelberg.

679. There is a portion of the shire of Whitelock from which people would not go on the present line to Wodonga, more than they would go on the line from Goulburn to Spencer-street. I have not calculated on any passengers outside the existing stations. If I took those outside areas, I should have to increase those figures.

679. I want the admission that you know nothing of the country or the productiveness of the population?—I know practically very little about that.

680. You told the Committee that there would be no goods coming in by the direct route, but it would go to Spencer-street. We will bring the goods the present route.

681. How are they getting the goods from Fitzroy and Collingwood at the present time?—The Fitzroy line is only open for goods, and the goods train runs there once a day; and the Collingwood I think there are two a day.

682. Are the goods delivered at the Collingwood station?—Yes.

683. Would they be delivered at the station if you extended it to Finsibar-street?—Yes, it would travel over the direct line; nor would any portion of it be credited to the direct line, unless you at the same time debit the direct line with the cost of the existing line, i.e., which it goes to Collingwood and Fitzroy now.

684. What line would it go to, supposing there is an extension?—There is a line from North Fitzroy to Fitzroy which cost a certain sum of money, and the line from Clifton Hill to Collingwood cost a certain sum of money, or the main line to Clifton Hill cost money. If you took any account of the business now done there in goods you would have to, on the other hand, increase the capital cost of these lines by adding the cost of these I have just mentioned.

685. If your argument is good for anything it is that the goods traffic is no good at all—I have not said so.

686. You say it is not worth while to take account of the goods that would come into Collingwood and Fitzroy?—I said you could not count that unless you debit the whole cost of those lines.

687. Do you admit there is any profit in carrying goods at all?—I do.

688. Why should there not be with the intermediate lines?—Why should you give the benefit to increased lines when you are not giving any increase to their capitalization?

689. Do you know the country beyond Heidelberg?—Very little.

690. Would you believe there are 125,000 tons of goods coming from that direction?—What kind of goods?

691. Every kind of goods—fruit, staff, hay, milk, firewood, stores, manures. I dare say there is a considerable quantity.

692. And you take no account for the people outside that line—do you deal more with Collingwood and Fitzroy than with Melbourne?—How far would they be from Collingwood and Fitzroy now?

693. The bulk of them over 20 miles, and for thousands of tons of traffic 50 miles?—There is no line constructed beyond Heidelberg.

694. Three-fifths of all this would come on the direct line. I have said that I anticipate there would be an increase on the direct lines by reason of the facilities to the people beyond, but it can only be guessed, as the lines have not been constructed beyond Heidelberg.

695. Have you not as much right to consider the lines not constructed there as you have the lines not constructed in the northern suburbs?—I will go so far as to say that if these lines are constructed in the future they will materially increase the business on those lines.

696. You believe there is a population numbering 20,000 that cannot be augmented by any other lines except the extension of those northern suburbs?—I am aware there is a considerable population.

697. Are you aware that there are from 7,000 to 10,000 acres of fruit-growing?—I know there is a considerable quantity.

698. And if it so comes in from that direction there are 50,000 tons of fruit?—Yes, I dare say there is a considerable quantity.

699. And does it not sound over 200 wagons coming in three times a week for eight weeks in the year with the fruit?—Our experience is that—people who go in for fruit and vegetable growing for the city market cart their staff chiefly within distances of up to 20 miles.

700. Four-fifths of this is over 20 miles?—Of course we would get a proportion of this.

701. I have the slightest idea as to the average under hay, potatoes, and cereals in that part—I have not.

702. Can you give the number of tons of milk that come from that part into the city?—No.

703. Can you give the number of pounds of milk that a cow will produce in twelve months?—I cannot say.

704. There are 2,000 milking cows producing 4,000 lbs. of milk each in that area, that would be 3,571 tons of milk. Does any one believe for one moment that they would cart milk 15 miles and bring it probably to Melbourne?—No, they would send the milk by rail.

705. At present they bring it in with drays 30 miles, and it is a great handicap to them when they have to cart firewood in a day for that distance—there are not less than 20,000 tons of firewood coming in over the Merri Creek from that quarter?—I know there is a considerable quantity.

706. Thirty-five thousand tons of that are sold in Fitzroy and Collingwood. I have put down here between 7,000 and 10,000 tons of stores to supply the 20,000 people, and where there are 8,000 or 10,000 acres of fruit-growing it would require at least 15,000 tons of manures, and there would be
at any rate 140,000 tons backward and forward out and in on those lines?—I have already stated that the lines were constructed beyond there every line constructed and every addition to the prosperity of the country beyond will feed the inner portion.

707. By Mr. J. X. White.—When you take a ticket from the station to another you have to get out—the railways do not give a transfer. Are you aware that with the trains from Abbotsford you can get into one there, and then get a transfer at Smith-street, do your business there, and then go on with the same fare?—Is not that a great advantage to what your railway will be?—I dare say that if it were found to be an advantage when the lines were constructed we might do the same.

708. Your line does not go along the street where the business is—the trains go with the business consequently when you come to Smith-street do you do your business there, and go on with the same fare?—We could always do the same thing if we had any good reason for doing it. I do not see why we should not do it were a matter of competing with the trains.

709. You think that would not decrease the revenue?—No, I do not think it would have much effect on the other.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourning to Tuesday next, at seven o'clock.

________________________

TUESDAY, 13TH OCTOBER, 1896.

Members present:—
Mr. Cameron, in the Chair;
The Hon. D. Melville, M.L.C.; Mr. Burton,
The Hon. E. Mory, M.L.C.; Mr. Conran,
Mr. Kerris,
Mr. J. S. White.

Thomas H. McLean, examined, having made an affirmation.

710. By the Chairman.—What are you?—A tanner and leather merchant. I have been living at Northcote the last twelve years. I am intimately acquainted with the country round about.

711. Are you aware there are two lines of railway before the Committee?—Yes. I think the residents of Northcote are under the impression they are entitled to direct railway communication. As it is at present we suffer very great inconvenience through not having it, but we see under the impression that the Government or the Railway Commissioners are looking largely through not bringing the people direct to the city.

712. Which way do you get to the city now?—By tram as a rule—when I do not drive I go by tram.

713. What time does it take you to get from your place to the centre of the city by tram?—I think about three-quarters of an hour.

714. What time does the tram take to Spencer-street?—Close on thirty minutes.

715. In what time would you expect to be taken into town if you had direct communication?—I think about fourteen or fifteen minutes.

716. In time of any consequence to the people of Northcote?—Yes, it is a matter of great consequence. Going by tram you have to pay two tram fares, and there is the length of time it occupies as well.

717. Supposing the tram reduced the time to the price of the tram, which would you take?—I would take the railway in preference to the tram at any time, because of the advantage of the monthly ticket, return ticket and so on, and its occupying very much less time.

718. Supposing the railway were made direct under Young-street to Prince’s Bridge, would you take that line rather than take the tram?—Yes, decidedly.

719. Would it be as convenient for people in your neighbourhood?—I think it would be very much more convenient; it is what they have been looking for a long time. Ever since I have been associated with Northcote people have been under the impression that they were going to direct railway communication. I do not think I would have had my private house there if I had not believed so.

720. What is the population of the town?—7,250. Five years ago the population was 7,100, so that there is a considerable increase, though a great many people have left and gone to Western Australia and other places.

721. What proportion of these people do you think would travel every day by train to the city and back?—Almost every one who has business would go by train if there were a direct line. I cannot give the exact number, perhaps 5,000 out of the 7,000. I have had a tenant in Northcote for the last eighteen months, and this morning I had notice from him—the reason assigned for leaving was that two of the boys were to be sent to town every morning; they have to leave at quarter past seven, and get into town at twenty minutes past eight, and have to preface the town until the warehouse is open. They intend going to Parkville, I believe, or some convenient place where they can have their work done so as to get to town at the time the warehouse is open.

722. You think if you had better means of getting in and out of town it would increase the population?—Decidedly. I think the population would increase largely, because it is a healthy district, and there a plenty of land being occupied.

723. Where would they come from?—Other suburbs, I presume; the colony is increasing every day—they come from England and Scotland and settle here.

724. Would the construction of the line pay?—I presume it would. Other suburbs, such as St. Kilda, South Yarra, Richmond, and Hawthorn, have had their railways for years, and those lines are paying, though they have just the same competition as exists, in the event of our railway being made, in the shape of trams.

725. You think the Young-street route would be a better one than the Hoddle-street one?—Yes, I think it would be more direct for Northcote, Whittlesea, and so on.
726. Have you any idea how far people would travel to reach one of those lines coming through the thinly-populated places between Northeaster and town? — Perhaps three-quarters of a mile or half-a-mile each side.

727. You think they would lay a tram line and go to the railway? — I think so. The facilities of quick travelling and the advantage of having monthly or annual tickets, as the case may be, would be an inducement to people to pass by the tram.

728. You think they would go from Nicholson-street to Young-street rather than come by tram? — I think so; that is a not a long distance at all. I know, as far as I am concerned, if there were a direct railway I would probably not keep a house and loggy at all for town, but come in and out by rail. I could have a periodical ticket and come home to Epsom.

729. You send a lot of goods away from your storehouse? — Most of our goods go to the warehouse first, but we send away a good many goods locally.

730. You would not send much by rail from Northeaster? — No, it goes to the warehouse first, and then is hauled up and sent away by train; it is sent to Spencer-street. At present we do not send anything away by rail; we get large quantities of bark, but we find it inconvenient to go round by the Royal Park — it is more expensive; the traffic is greater.

731. Where do you get the back from? — From almost everywhere. A great deal of it comes from Gippsland, some from the north-east and Campaspe, and as far away as the South Australian border; that all comes by rail. We had about 400 tons last season from Gippsland alone.

732. By Mr. J. S. White. — Your bark mainly comes by train, and its destination is Spencer-street? — No. We have an arrangement with the railways Commissioners to take it to the Collingwood railway station.

733. Is it more convenient to you to get it from Collingwood than to have it delivered at the Northeaster station? — What is the advantage of a railway if you have to bring it on road from Collingwood when you have a railway which is directly to Northeaster? — I have no special arrangement with the Government before it came direct to Northeaster by rail, but there is no weighbridge there; we have to bring the bark to Collingwood so as to have it weighed.

734. Spencer-street would not be much farther for goods? — Yes, a long way farther.

735. In the first instance the bark is delivered at Spencer-street from the country, and it comes from there to Collingwood? — We have a special arrangement with the Department; we are the only ones that they do not charge.

736. Could not your bark be run up to the weighbridge at Spencer-street? — That would not satisfy the people who correspond to us. We have to have a weighbridge ticket when we send their account sales and pay them for the bark.

737. Is it not usual to run a truck on the weighbridge at Spencer-street, take the gross weight, and deduct the weight of the track? — Yes.


739. Is the Government weighbridge not so accurate as the private one? — I think the Government merely want to get at the weigh of the bark for freight purposes; they are not particular when they weigh a truck in that way.

740. By Mr. Craven. — Are you tied down to any particular route for this connection? — I prefer the Fitzroy route.

741. Suppose the Fitzroy route were not carried out; would you sooner have the Collingwood route than none at all? — Yes, certainly. I presume, in the event of one of the lines from Fitzroy, the Collingwood route would be given later on, and in the event of our having the Collingwood line, the Fitzroy route would be given later on.

742. By the Hon. D. McVeigh. — What time does it take you to travel from Middle Northcote with the convenience that you have now into the city? — In the sense that is, with trains or railway? — I am not satisfied with the roundabout way of getting to town by all that I have not travelled that way more than three or four times altogether, although I have had various tickets and could go when I liked.

743. When you take a train what time is consumed in getting to the city from Middle Northcote? — I think about 30 minutes.

744. There is another 30 minutes to come home again? — Yes; then every time you step on the train you have to part your hands and pay.

745. It is practically prohibitive for young people who are engaged in town to live in Northcote: young boys in various shops and trades cannot live in Northcote? — No, it is very expensive and very inconvenient for them to have to go by train. A great many of them who are receiving low wages have to walk from their homes to the nearest tram, and walk about the streets until the business hours are open.

746. And the same in the evening? — Yes, so I believe.

747. By the Chairman. — One question that weighs with the people where opposing these motions subscribe lines is that you declare to become responsible for any loss that may accrue? — It has not been considered in our council, but if the other suburbs have their direct railways then that responsibility shouldn't be struck on us when it has not been on the others. As far as I am concerned I am almost confident that the railway would pay from the beginning, and there would be no more unprofitable time for making it — the values of land are so low as present, labour is cheap, and the building of the line would give employment and prevent people from leaving the colony. Besides, the ratepayers have no control in the management of the railway; the thing may be mismanaged, and through mismanagement it may result in a loss. I think it would hardly be fair that the ratepayers should be called upon to wake up that loss.

748. You are aware there is a few compelling the district through which the line goes to provide the land? — Yes.

749. Would you be prepared to provide the land required? — As far as I am concerned it would want a little more consideration.

750. By the Hon. D. McVeigh. — This railway does not pass through Northcote; there is no land required in Northcote for it? — No.

751. As far as the difficulty of the assessment is concerned, if the Department finds that you are to be benefited you do not anticipate that your district will throw any obstacles in the way of finding any deficiency of interest? — No, I think they would be quite willing to find their proportion as far as Northcote is concerned. I cannot speak for Fitzroy and Collingwood.
As far as your district is concerned you will comply with the law?—Yes, I believe so.

752. By the Hon. E. Morry.—What is the difference in the distance between going round by Spencer-street and the direct route?—I think one is about double. The distance of the direct route is 14½ miles, and the distance of the other route is about 29½ miles.

753. If the Government were to run faster trains, would that not suit Northcote?—No, we would not have direct railway communication, and I do not think the Government could do that as so as to satisfy the suburban people. We have a suburban service still now; we have a train now and again.

754. You have the trains regularly?—Yes, but there is the objection that they are expensive.

755. By Mr. J. S. White.—What is the fare from Northcote to the Morristown-bridge?—From my house a single fare is 2d., and to go to Melbourne would be 3d. more; that makes 10d. for the return journey. When I go to town in the afternoon and take my family I prefer taking my horse and buggy and putting it up at the livery stable—it is cheaper to pay the livery man than to take the trains.

756. By the Hon. D. Mcmahon.—You regard the want of direct communication as a bar to the progress of the suburb?—Yes, and it will be as long as the place remains a suburb.

757. By Mr. Craven.—What is the fare by rail?—4½d. first class return and 3½d. second. I know some of my neighbours who have periodical tickets very often lose the trains and then have to go by train, because they would have to wait an hour or an hour and a half to wait.

The witness withdraws.

Caleb Youman, sworn and examined.

758. By the Chairman.—What are you?—Secretary of the County of Bourke Building Society. I reside at Northcote—I have lived there nineteen years.

759. What part of Northcote do you live in?—Close to the Town Hall, within about five minutes of it.

760. How do you come in and out?—I have been using the train for the last three years—I go to Spencer-street.

761. Do you take a train then to come to your place of business?—No, I am near enough to walk to without much inconvenience.

762. If you had a direct line from Northcote to Prince's-bridge, you would have a longer distance to walk?—I would prefer a direct line to the present one at Spencer-street notwithstanding that, because I am the only one in my family who uses the line, whereas if a direct line were made, probably the whole of the family would use it frequently. At present it is as near whatever to them from the times the trains run during the day and in the evening. I think there is a train leaving at 7.11 a.m., and there is no other train then until 8.24. The next is 10.15 a.m., and if you miss that you do not get one until 10 p.m. That happens to suit me personally, but it does not suit my boys who come into town. One of them has to leave by the 7.15 train to get into the office by eight o'clock, he has to knock about the city for twenty minutes. Practically the line at present as a suburban service is of no use at all, or very little. It is only those whose businesses are suites, who have fixed times for coming and going, who use it now. It returns in the evening from 7.15 to 10 p.m., which is too late; people who leave their office at five o'clock, and there is no other train until 7.34 p.m., which is the Whitney train, and a slow one, stopping at each station, picking up milk cases, and so on. The next train is 6.7 p.m.; the next is half past six; and then you do not get one until 8.45 p.m. Then if you want to come into town in the evening, I think there is a train about 7.20; that is too late to get into the theatre, and the one previous to that is too early.

763. How much does it cost you and your family to travel by train?—It costs me £3 10s. for a yearly ticket. My two boys go in by train, it does not suit them to go by train. They go backwards and forwards every day; they do not use the penny train. My place is sufficiently near the bridge for them to walk to the Clifton Hill train, but you may put it down at 6s. each per day. My wife never thinks of using the train—she likes the train travelling, but unless she happens to want to go to Williamstown or my place, she gets off at Northcote and can get on at the Clifton Hill, and she fears the train passing through, she never thinks of using it. The present service is no criterion whatever as to the traffic that would be developed by a short service and a frequent service.

764. How much would you contribute towards maintaining the line?—All my family are boys but one; three of the boys are going into town now, and I am looking forward to the time when the others will be going. If I remain in Northcote it is more than likely they will all use the railway. I should say at the least it must cost each of the boys that are going in now from £5 to £9 a year.

765. You would not expect to have to pay that if there were a direct line?—No. Of course, the fares would be increased on the present fares. It used to cost me, at the least, when I was using the train, from 3d. to 10d. a year—you cannot do it any cheaper.

766. You think the direct line would pay?—I feel convinced it would. There is a portion of the population which has been left out of consideration in the evidence I have read, and that is the portion of East Brunswick east of Lygon-street, towards the creek, north of Park-street. There is a large settlement there. They are too far away from the Sydney-road trains for the trains to compete against a railway if it were running at frequent intervals and at a reasonable distance from them.

767. Is there not another train to the north?—That goes only to the end of Rathdown-street, and it is blocked by blind streets, causing long detours. There are a fair number of men working in factories, stores, and stores who use the railway now from North Carlton and North Fitzroy—they must be men that the times suit to go to Spencer-street.

768. What have they to pay from North Fitzroy to Spencer-street?—4½d. and 3d.

769. Probably a good number from that locality would avail themselves of the railway, but how do you arrive at the conclusion that the line would pay?—Taking the Northcote traffic and judging by my own family, only one out of four going in and out of town uses the railway because the times of the railway do not suit the other members, and the same was would apply all round the district. The other members would use the railway if a direct line were made with a suburban service. You must bear in mind that the bulk of the wage-earners in Northcote are not earning their living in the place—they come into town or elsewhere to get their living. There is another thing in favour of the direct line through Fitzroy; at present we have a large number of resident people in Northcote who are employed in Smith-street and Brunswick-street and round that neighbourhood.
770. You are in favour of the Fitzroy route?—I am strongly in favour of the direct route, and the cause that goes through the greatest population.

771. You are a supporter of Norristow?—Yes.

772. Mr. J. S. W. W. What is the population of the north-west side of High-street that would likely be to feed the railway?—I could not say that.

773. What stations have you on the High-street line that sell your people?—I reckon none at all. The North-street station is practically of no value whatever to Norristow. No one by any stretch of imagination can make it of any use. It is a mile away down in the south-east corner, and sits on a plot of about 400 or 500 yards, where there is no population.

774. How far is your boundary from the Alphington station?—Fairfield is the nearest to our boundary.

775. Is that 10 chains away?—About that, I should think.

776. Do you think the people will walk from these areas to the other side to get the train?—There is very little settlement there at all; the bulk of the settlement is round the tops of the hills and round about the Northend and Middle Norristow stations. You get away then on to the North yard on the east side of the road.

777. What population is there east of Norristow-street in East Brunswick to feed the line?—I should say there is very little east of Lygon-street.

778. Would the people at the end of Lygon-street in Brunswick walk across to get to this station instead of going to the nearest tram?—I think so. I should do it myself. At the present time it is very large area open the line, even with its present facilities, to a reasonable extent—as much as their industries will do. My knowledge in connection with the society would go to show that. We have a number of people connected with free society who live in East Brunswick, and I know that numbers of members and their families are employed in Brunswick-street and South-street, and they would find it very inconvenient to get the communication that way. The boys and girls have to walk most of the distance. People have themselves added to their little homes, and have to struggle on the best way they can.

779. Would the present population pay for the line if it does not increase?—I think it will give quite as good a return as some of the country lines that have been made within the last twelve to eighteen months. I have every confidence myself that the line will pay if it is run on proper principles, as the lines are run on the south of the Yarra. There is no reason why the lines in a year or two should not pay.

780. You think if the fares were the same as they are on the south of the Yarra your population would increase, and the line would pay?—There is a natural increase going on.

781. Would you like to pay the same rates as they pay on the south of the Yarra?—I suppose we would have to pay at the same rate.

782. Is the building society interested in this matter?—I do not know.

783. The members expect their property to increase in value?—We hope so.

784. If it does increase in value, would the society be prepared, if the line does not pay working expenses, to make up any portion of the difference?—We have never discussed that. I am not speaking now as secretary of the building society; I merely represent the Norristow Council. I suppose the council would be prepared to give the question serious and fair consideration.

785. By Mr. Greer.—What is the real cause of the difficulty in regard to the tram service?—I could never understand that. Remember on one occasion, acting on behalf of a number of regular passengers, putting in a petition to the Railway Department asking them to change the times of starting the trains to make it more convenient, and the answer was that, at an alteration in the time would interfere with the running of some trains to Coburg, the request could not be complied with. My own impression is that, if the Department would run the line on business principles and try and cater for the traffic, they would do better than they do now.

786. If they gave you one of those consolidation cars or a motor and not a frequent service, say, every twenty minutes, would that increase the traffic on the line?—I do not think a motor and a car would be sufficient.

787. I think a twenty minutes service would develop a much larger traffic than they have at present.

788. When they first opened the line did they run a more frequent service?—No, I think not.

789. The rest reason the service is not a success is that they are not catering for the public requirements?—I would not say that; but I think they could make the present results better by giving a little more attention to the service at the busy times of the day. I leave the office at half-past five for the simple reason that I cannot get a train that suits me earlier than 5.35 p.m. Under ordinary circumstances, I could leave the office at five o'clock, but to catch a train previous to that I should have to leave at a quarter to five.

790. If they gave you a better service in the morning and evening, that would probably have some effect on the traffic?—I would improve the traffic I believe.

791. By Mr. E. Smee.—Supposing this line were made, what guarantee would the Government have that the trains would not come into competition and bring the fares down to half-price; would your people be prepared to guarantee any loss?—I do not think we would be asked to do that. I think if the Department would cater for the public requirements, the traffic would increase.

792. You do not suppose that the trains are going to stand still and not run in competition against the railways?—They will not cut our own trains. I do not think that danger is worth taking into consideration.

793. There is a network of tram in that district, and if the Government go into competition the company will bring down the prices?—Why have they not done it south of the river?

794. By Mr. Urquhart.—After considering the matter fully, are you still of opinion there would be a considerable number of people in East Brunswick who would use the tram service?—I think so.

795. You mean the people living in Belmore-street and north of the existing line?—Yes.

796. According to this plan there is a railway running to the north of Pakenham already, competing with Spencer-street, with a station at North Fitzroy and another at Unwin?—Yes, but it is twice the distance than this line would be.
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796. You know the lines from North Fitzroy to Spencer-street—21d. and 3½, I think; they are uniform, they are on the same principle. You have to pay the same to Macau nears or North Melbourne. It is a question of time and distance. The North Fitzroy and North Carlton stations are twice the distance from Melbourne that they will be by the proposed lines.

797. By the Hon. D. Melville.—Do you think any number of trains run on the circle right round by Royal Park would ever satisfy the people of Northcote?—No, I do not think so; it has failed to do so up to the present.

798. Did you read the evidence of Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mr. Ronick, giving the rise from Flinders-street to the junction at Northcote, varying from Grey-street to North Fitzroy, at from three minutes to seven. If these times were allowable by the Department, what would you think of that?—That is less than half the time it took at the present time. If they ran on time from Spencer-street to Northcote station it is 21 minutes.

799. Could any competition set up by tram touch that?—I do not think so.

800. Could any competition prevent the development of Northcote?—I do not think so; I do not think there is anything to fear from that.

801. Your grievance is that you are not back practically a quarter of an hour?—Yes; and the extra fees that we have to pay if we come into town by train.

802. Do you think the people of Northcote would refuse to do part of the matter?—I do not think they would, but, of course, that is purely financial.

803. You know the law that the district benefited have to guarantee the interest of the local people, which would amount to something £200,000. Northcote may be named by the Railway Department as one of the places that would gain. Would the people raise any difficulty about that provided they were to obtain this tremendous advantage of seven or eight minutes?—I do not think so.

804. By Mr. Harris.—I understand you to say that the question of the guarantee has yet to be considered?—Yes.

805. In a communication sent to the various members of the Committee, signed on behalf of the town of Northcote, the site of Preston, the site of Epping, and the site of Whittlesea, the following paragraph appears:—"It is proposed that the districts to be served shall give the guarantee imposed by the Railways Construction Act, the Young-street route would confer the munificent gift on all the municipalities interested, adopted by a conference of all the undersigned municipalities."—I mean that question has not been formally before each council for adoption or otherwise.

The witness withdrew.

Edwin Hastings, sworn and examined.

806. By the Chairman.—What are you?—An estate agent, residing in Northcote. I have been there for 42 years.

807. You have heard the evidence of the previous witnesses; have you anything to add to what they have said?—No. I can only reiterate what they have stated. I agree with their evidence. I believe if there were a direct line it would be paid; I know the district is suffering through not having it; we have been handicapped for years. We have been kept in a much worse position than the suburbs south of the Yarra. We have been entitled to railways as much as other portions of the State, but we have had to contribute our proportion of the loss without the advantages of a railway service.

808. Are the southern railways not run at a loss?—No, and ours would not if we had it. There is no doubt a direct line would pay. Traffic must go, if a man goes to see his friends they return the visit.

809. You do not see any difficulty in coping with the service already in the district in the shape of trains?—No.

810. Would you run the trains off?—The population would increase to supply both. Northcote is increasing rapidly. Collingwood and Fitzroy are the seat of working places and factories, and there is not much room to build there, so the people must come out north. At present there are not half-a-dozen decent houses empty in Northcote.

811. What is the rent for a five or six roomed house in Northcote?—From 6s. to 8s. Northcote has been increasing all through the last period.

812. By Mr. J. S. White.—Are there as many people there now as there were during the boom time?—Yes, because the houses are full.

813. Have they not to go elsewhere to get work?—I believe the majority of the people living in Northcote get their living somewhere else.

814. By the Chairman.—Are the people generally in Northcote as prosperous as they were 30 years ago?—I do not think they are as happy and contented.

815. By Mr. J. S. White.—Yes were at Northcote when this Outer Circle scheme was mooted?—Yes.

816. Before the Hobson's Bay railway was purchased?—I think the Hobson's Bay line was purchased before the Outer Circle was agitated for.

817. The people of Northcote were aware when they were getting this line that it was a round-about thing; did they ever complain about it and say it was no use to them?—I do not know.

818. By the Chairman.—The Outer Circle was not constructed for the convenience of Northcote?—No, it was to carry the goods from Geelong direct to Spencer-street and the cattle yards.

819. By Mr. J. S. White.—Why did not you condemn the line to Preston?—Parliament passed the line, and had engineers to carry it out; we were helpless, but we thought they were mad.

The witness withdrew.

John C. Thompson, sworn and examined.

820. By the Chairman.—What are you?—A grocer and produce merchant, residing at Northcote, carrying on business in Fitzroy and other places. I have been there eight years. I am a councillor of the town of Northcote.

821. How do you get your goods in and out?—We are largely interested in the grain trade. At present the bulk of it comes to the Fitzroy station for the Fitzroy business, but very frequently we have it
consigned to Spencer-street. Stuff coming from Whitleyson we have to send to the North Clarkson station, and there is only one goods train coming to the Fitzroy spur per day. If we had a direct line through we would get the consignments from the ordinary trains by going through the ordinary trains and divided between Fitzroy and North Fitzroy. When they send small goods they generally have there put in the guard's van, but a truck or the greater portion of a truck we are obliged to send to Spencer-street for, or have it sent round by the morning train to the Fitzroy station.

As now some do you send up towards the Fitzroy beyond Northcote? — I could not tell the exact quantity, but we send a large lot of stuff; the bulk of the people send in for their goods and take them by the road.

923. If there was a direct line by Youngstreet they would use the railway instead of their own vehicles? — I am certain of it. At present the people that come to us to buy nearly all come in by road in their conveyances, whereas if we had a direct line they would come by rail; they have told us that repeatedly.

924. The returning wood carts take a lot of goods back? — They do; they nearly all set as carriers and take back loading.

925. Would these men send their sawmood by train or still come into town with their drays? — I think it would be divided; I do not think it would all come by train, a large portion of it would.

926. Do you buy much produce from that district? — Yes, we buy a lot of stuff, and in the fruit season we act as agents for a large number of the growers when they ship apples to London. We sent 1,000 odd cases last year and 1,000 odd the year before last. We must have sent a few thousand cases of apples to the East; we shipped them as long as we could procure them. This year we contemplate doing double the business. A lot of that came by rail, and the cases were sent up by rail.

927. You get the fruit from the Diamond Creek district? — Yes, I am secretary of the Arthur's and Diamond Creek Fruit Exporters' Society.

928. Would they send a large portion of the fruit that comes into Melbourne from those districts by rail if they had better accommodation? — I am sure of it; they have told me so repeatedly.

929. Do many of them send by rail now? — When they send goods to the city they send produce to the market they send is to Spencer-street, but if they have to send fruit to supply people in the portion of the city they invariably send it by road, they would not think of sending it into the city and having to eat it back.


931. Have you seen the large number of people arriving from St. Kilda and Bulimba and other lines morning and evening by train in the Flinders-street station? — Yes.

932. Do you see anything to prevent the centre of Fitzroy being as large a contributor to the railway as these places? — Nothing whatever.

933. Is it a disappointment to young people that they cannot get monthly tickets? — It is. We reside close to Wonthaggi-george, a quarter of a mile from St. George's-road, and I travel to Fitzroy to business every day, but I cannot use the train. The only time the train can be used is when people are going into the city proper. It is useless to people living in our parish, except for going into the city. In my opinion there is one important factor that has been overlooked by those who have given evidence prior to me, that is that the bulk of people residing in Northcote, as well as the suburbs beyond the creek, have business relations with Fitzroy and Collingwood, and the railway as it is constructed now is so equally used to them at all. I do not see that they travel into the city proper that they travel a dozen times into Fitzroy or Collingwood. I suppose my case is not so isolated one. I have occasion to use the tram three or four times a day, into the city occasionally. I am constantly using the tram, but I would use the train if we had a direct line, and we would have other members of the family. Smith-street draws people from all parts of Melbourne and all parts of the colony, but they are obliged to use the tram service. That is the reason why the tram company objects to the construction of this line, because they are confident it will interfere with their present traffic. That is one of the best arguments we can have in favour of the line.

934. How many no one in your own mind to the tremendous trade which would be done if we could get the site-table inquired by Mr. Fitzpatrick and Mr. Rennick; i think three minutes to Grey-street, and so on, through Fitzroy? — Not the slightest. I am confident that the line would not only improve the district, but the district in improving would improve the prospects of the line almost immediately it was constructed.

935. We would get all the traffic of the up-country people, instead of their using the trams? — Yes. Take the resident of Heidelberg; there are only a number of them engaged in business in Fitzroy and Collingwood. They invariably get out at Clifton Hill station and take the tram to their place in Fitzroy and Collingwood. There is another section of people that get out at South Northcote station and walk across to the Northcote station and catch the train from Preston or Whitleyson into the city. These people would never think of taking the present service, skirting the city, and walking back to their destination. It is practically useless.

936. As a business man, knowing the surroundings, have you any doubt as to its being a paying speculation if long going? — I do not think so.

937. Would you be willing to comply with what the law requires? — Yes, as a private member of the Northcote Council, I would. I think myself, the result will be that the valuation of the property will increase, and our revenue will increase to such an extent that we will be more than repaid for any amount we may guarantee.

938. The district engaged in the fruit industry is practically unlimited? — Yes. I know that district well.

939. What does a case of fruit realize on the average? — We got from 8s. up to 15s. a case for fruit sent to London ever and above prices.

940. The hold for this sort of thing in these districts is simply enormous? — Every year the quantity is increasing. The Government has been granting a bonus for planting out, and nearly all the orchards in the district have been complying with the Act. I am ascertaining to what extent these bonuses are. There are blocks of 5, 10, 15, and 20 acres of trees all coming to maturity, and in a very short time every one of the orchardists will have three or four times more fruit to dispose of than they have now, and they will have to depend upon expectation to get rid of it.
811. They have done this without railway communication! —Yes; it is done by drays at present, but they all will, especially if the fruit is to be expected, use the railway. For instance, last season we had a lot of apples consigned to Spencer-street, and then carted from there down to Port Melbourne port; it would all go to Spencer-street if it is for expectation. We cannot lose sight of the fact that the present supply of fruit is more than ample for local requirements, and all the growers in that district are planting out shipping tons.

812. Is it not possible to grow fruit? —Yes; they are all well-off there.

813. Do you know any of these who have made money at this business? —Yes, a few of them.

814. Have half-a-dozen of them made fortunes? —Yes. I consider that these few men have a good fortune when they clear 20 or 30 acres and have it under good fruit-bearing trees. They have all their fortune invested in the land and their income is secure as long as they live.

815. Do you know any man who has made £30,000 or £50,000 in that district? —Yes.

816. There is an unlimited Field for the young people of Fitzroy and Collingwood to get away in that direction! —Yes.

817. By Mr. J. S. White. —You say if a direct line were constructed the fruit would come by rail? —Yes, a great deal of it.

818. More than it does now? —Yes.

819. Why? —The cost would be less, the distance is shorter, it is reduced about 3 miles.

820. Have you read the traffic manager’s evidence? —No.

821. Do you know that there is a minimum rate and a maximum distance on the railways? —No.

822. Will going an extra 2 or 3 miles injure the fruit? —Yes, the more oscillation the fruit is subjected to the more damage there is done. Fruit, when packed for export, must be perfectly free of bruises. If an apple is allowed to fall it will show no mark or sign of that fall, but before it gets to its destination it will be partially decayed.

823. You think the extra 3 miles would make a difference. How would the people coming 100 miles do in this? —Probably they would not have it shipped in the city.

824. You have one goods train a day coming to Fitzroy station. Is it the same station of Brunswick-street your store? —The lower portion only, below the Union Mill.

825. That station would be your nearest station at any time? —Yes.

826. Would not one train a day be enough at any time? —We do not allow any one to consign better or perishable goods to the Fitzroy station in the summer time. Before you could get the goods they would be slightly affected by the weather.

827. There are very few country lines that have more than two trains a day? —Yes, but you want to get it immediately it arrives in it. It may come down in the middle of the day to Spencer-street and may have to remain there until the following morning to get round to Fitzroy.

828. What advantage would a straight line be to you? —Immediately the goods came to Spencer-street they would be sent on to their destinations.

829. Considering there is to be as good station on this direct route, what advantage would it be to you then; the goods would have to go to Spencer-street as before? —Boxes of better, cases of eggs, and so on are put in the general vans, and these are the kind that I specially refer to. They would be taken there and left. Prior to their altering the system we used to have the goods consigned to Fitzroy, but now we have it all consigned to Spencer-street and have to send to Spencer-street for it.

830. Your business place is at the lower end of Brunswick-street and the station is not so near to you as the tram. Do you think you would go to the station if you wanted to be let down in the centre of the city? —Yes, I would have an annual ticket and it would not cost me anything extra.

831. If you wanted to do business in the centre of the city, would you walk up to Johnstone-street to be landed in Flinders-street? —Yes, I should. Economy is the secret of success.

832. Would it not take you longer to walk up to the station from your store, go to Flinders-street, and walk up to the centre of the city, than to go by train? —No, because at present there are about seven minutes between each train. I would walk to the station and back again while I was waiting for one.

833. If you just miss a train you would have to walk twenty minutes? —You would time your business so as to fit in with the train.

834. The council of Northcote and other councils have agreed to become part guarantors. What right have you, as a councillor, to send us this paper before consulting the ratepayers? —We presume that the ratepayers have sufficient confidence in us.

835. Have you power under the Act to do it without consulting them? —There are circumstances that arise when representatives in councils as well as in the House of Assembly feel that they are quite justified in taking upon themselves the responsibility, and afterwards laying the facts of the case before their constituents. No doubt, if the ratepayers thought we had transgressed or gone beyond the bounds of wisdom they would have held public meetings or protested, but they feel it is of vital importance to them, and they are quite prepared to support us in anything we do to get this direct line.

836. Why was not a meeting of the ratepayers called? —The ratepayers are all favouring for this line.

837. How do you know? —By expression of feeling. The last time I had to contest an election at Northcote I had a long question.

838. Did you ask them if they would undertake to pay any less if called upon to do so? —It was not then considered by the House, as I could not do so.

839. Why have you said so in this paper? —Because we thought we were justified in doing so.

840. By the Rev. O. Melville. —You have no doubt about the people being willing to do what the law requires them to do in this matter? —No.

841. If you were to call a public meeting in Northcote or Fitzroy about this matter, what kind of meeting would you get? —I believe we would have a very enthusiastic meeting of representative people in Northcote, not I believe the property-owners would be so considerate that the line would benefit the town generally, that they would thoroughly oppose what we have done.

842. By Mr. J. S. White. —Would that be the case in Fitzroy as a whole? —I am not here to represent Fitzroy, but, speaking as a member of Fitzroy, I should think if the council did what we have done they would do so what was quite right.
873. **By the Hon. E. Morley.**—You know the district well where the fruit is grown—how many tons is produced every year?—I would not say.

874. **What percentage is exported to the other colonies and home?**—I would not say. I know the quantity that is brought in is something enormous, and where we sent 1,000 cases last year we could send from 5,000 to 10,000 cases. I know there is no district in the whole of the colony that can supply better fruit than that. It is a new district, and the fruit is perfectly clean.

875. **The people bringing it into the different places of business round the city and suburbs would not send it by train?**—They would go to Fitzroy and Collingwood if we had a direct line.

876. **They would bring it to Fitzroy?**—Yes. The business people would have it conveyed to them at Fitzroy, and they would go there and get it, but they cannot have that now, because they only have one goods train a day, and that is principally made up of all kinds of grain, wood, and coal.

877. **What is the size of the orchards in that district?**—There is one 200 acres, another about 100 acres, another 150 acres, another 50 or 60 acres.

878. **What is about the age of those orchards?**—They have been planting out every year, so that they have the trees coming on, and when the trees get too old they tear them out and plant fresh ones. They are in full bearing in five to seven years.

879. **By Mr. Barton.**—What is your idea as to the volume of traffic from Northcote; where do you suppose the great volume of Northcote passengers would go to?—Collingwood and Fitzroy.

880. **The traffic to Spencer-street and Flinders-street would not be considerable?**—It would be larger than it is now; but the bulk of the traffic that we would gain by having a direct line would go to Collingwood and Fitzroy.

881. **Would the charge for that traffic?**—I presume people would largely use annual tickets.

882. Do you understand that the people in Northcote feel that the time between Northcote and Spencer-street is the difficulty?—Yes.

883. **What is the time?—About half-an-hour.**

884. **Is 25 minutes to Flinders-street and 21 minutes to Spencer-street an excessive time?**—You can travel by the train in twenty minutes to the heart of the city of Melbourne—that is, from the Merri Bridge. The Brunswick-street train is the one that takes nearly all the people from the densely-populated portion to the west of High-street; that is a traffic that at the present time you are almost entirely losing, as well as the East Brunswick and North Caulfield traffic.

885. The grievances in the mind of the distance you are taken round?—Yes.

886. **If that journey only occupied 21 minutes your grievance would be greatly removed.**—The people do a great deal of business in this portion of the city at the top of Bourke-street and Collins-street. It is not only the men it takes to go by train to Flinders-street or Spencer-street, but it is getting back.

887. **How would you be benefited by a direct line?**—There is to be a station somewhere about here I think, and it would take less time, so that you would be able to get to your destination in the time it now takes to travel from Northcote to Flinders-street.

**The witness withdraws.**

William George Swift, sworn and examined.

888. **By the Chairman.**—What are you?—Town clerk of Northcote. I have been there between ten and eleven years.

889. You have heard the evidence of the previous witnesses?—Yes.

890. **Do you agree with them?**—Yes, to a great extent. I think Councillor Yeomans overlooked one point—that we would get more traffic from the Northcote South station than he thinks if the Fitzroy line is connected. Because you have a long line which would carry the Heidelberg traffic, and there is a large population round about that station in the lower part of Northcote at the present time. As far as that part of Northcote is concerned, you might say no one travels on that line, but if the line went through to Melbourne from there a lot of people would use that line who now use the Clifton Hill trains. The argument is that the tramway company would lose traffic, but, at the same time, the population is not always going to remain the same. When the Lilydale line was constructed the people on the line increased. They might have drawn to a little extent on the other suburbs, but not much. As to the point that the railways are going to compete against the railways, the line will not be constructed tomorrow, and we will be fighting ourselves by the time it is finished. As to the exodus to Western Australia, I know of my own knowledge that a large amount of the money earned there is coming to this colony. This line can be looked at solely from a passenger point of view, and the main thing is shortness in the journey. The longer the journey the further it takes you away from Melbourne. You can live at Box Hill at present and get into town nearly as quick as we can, and have the advantage of a monthly or quarterly or half-yearly ticket. That practically puts us as far from Melbourne as Box Hill, though we are only 4 miles and they are 10.

891. **By the Hon. D. Metcalfe.**—Is the feeling of discontent general in the district?—Yes. Any one that visits Northcote for the first time will say, "What an outlandish place this is."

892. **By Mr. J. S. White.**—You would not be in favour of closing the station on the Heidelberg line close to the Merri Creek-bridge?—No.

893. **We have evidence there is no traffic there?—The reason of that is that the Northcote South railway station is so close to the Clifton Hill tramway that it is no use any one living there getting into the train, because they have to go to Johnston-street and get into the train there, whereas they can walk to the Clifton Hill tram and get on to it without getting into the train at all.

894. **By the Hon. F. Moore.**—Which line do you think is the most suitable one for the population?—We want the shortest and quickest way of getting into the city, therefore we favour the Fitzroy direct line. We have now about 2,000 homes in Northcote, and the population has changed greatly in the last two years. It was formerly mainly engaged in the town, but at present, from a railway point of view, it is better, because they are nearly all working outside.

895. **By the Hon. D. Metcalfe.**—And how many ratepayers have you?—On the roll I suppose there are about 1,250. I think the assessments are about 6,000. During the boom the place was split up into allotments.
896. There is practically an unlimited field for suburban residences?—Yes, of excellent sites.
897. You have no doubt about the railway paying?—I think not.
898. By Mr. J. S. White.—What is the population of the town?—2,500.
899. And the annual rates are about 2,000 to 4,500; those below 8½ would not be included in that.
900. How many would there be on the Assembly roll?—About 5,000.
901. By Mr. H. A. A.—A conference was held of the municipality consisting of Preston, Epping, Whitmanes, and the town of Northcote.—Was the guarantee there the individual opinion of the delegations or did they express the opinion of the ratepayers?—To a great extent it was the opinion of those present at the conference. As far as the council is concerned I do not think any definite resolution has been passed on the matter, actually agreeing to bear a proportion of the interest, but I believe the feeling of the municipality is that they have to accept the law as it is, and if they had to do it they would do it.
902. Do you think there would be any difficulty in getting the guarantee? The Act requires from the people of Northcote? I do not think so. They are so heavily handicapped by the want of proper communication that they would be prepared to risk it for the sake of the additional value in their properties.

The railway will be.

Alexander Hulme, sworn and examined.

903. By the Chairman.—What are you?—Mayor of Fitzroy. I am a furniture warehouseman, residing in Gore-street, Fitzroy. I have been in Fitzroy sixteen years.
904. Are you in favour of getting direct communication with the northern suburbs?—Yes, I favour the Young-street route, believing that it would be much more convenient and more in the interests of the outside portions, because it would take them sooner, and it is a shorter route than going round the Collingwood way.
905. It is shorter than by going round by Royal Park?—Yes.
906. Are all the people of Fitzroy in favour of that route?—The vast majority.
907. Even with a tunnel?—Even with a tunnel.
908. Why do you advocate that line or any line; are you not sufficiently accommodated at present?—I think it would be a paying line from the start, providing the line with Coburg line is made as suggested per plan submitted.
909. Do you not believe in the estimate of the railway Department?—I would rather not touch on that point.
910. As a rule, the citizens are in favour of that line?—Yes, they believe it would pay from the very start. I have gone over the line, and we consider by adopting this route you would tap all the centres of population—Brunswick, Northcote, Heidelberg, and a large portion of Collingwood, and come through the centre of the town. The only portions the tram does not touch. For instance, the East Brunswick people are supplied with an old line; but by this route we would tap that large population. There is also a large population in North Fitzroy who would travel by rail who cannot travel at present.
911. How far west would they come to feel the Fitzroy line?—I reckon that we would take the Coburg line right through and all Brunswick.
912. Would they pass the various lines of tram to go to the Fitzroy line?—I think so, because it would be cheaper. I do not think the tramways would injure the line in the slightest.

The railway will be.

John McPhail, sworn and examined.

913. By the Chairman.—What are you?—I am an officer and a councillor of the city of Fitzroy I have resided in Fitzroy about 36 years. [The witness read the following paper:—]

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,

I appear before the Committee as a member of the Fitzroy City Council, and as one of the representatives of that city appointed by the council to give evidence with regard to direct railway communication. This question has been before the northern suburbs for many years. We have had numerous discussions of municipal bodies and sections offering the drawback of a direct line through Fitzroy which has all the time been favoured by the districts to be served. We have also had repeated requests from Ministers of Railways during the past ten years that these districts would receive proper recognition by the construction of adequate railway communication.

It is desirable that I should place before the Committee a statement of the case on which the northern suburbs base their claim for direct railway connexion with the heart of the city. We consider the reasons so evident and satisfactory that sometimes we are a little surprised that those not so well acquainted with the northern suburbs require them to be stated in detail.

The suburban railway traffic is largely a passenger traffic, and our first claim is that we have a larger population and a more densely populated area than any other part of the metropolis. This population travels largely on a large proportion of daily traffic, and if afforded quick and cheap access to the city, to the seashore, and to the country, ventures to predict a development of traffic which will exceed anything hitherto at present by the Department. The only provision necessary is a short direct connecting line linking the northern suburbs to the main railway system. This means to the second factor in the situation, and one which has to be considered by the Department and by all concerned. The existing lines are supposed to be of some service to the northern suburbs, but as a matter of fact because of their dilapidations route and the absurd location in which they are constructed, the shareholders in the route are now run round the outskirts of the district and avoid the population they claim an annual loss on the Department.

The Committee has been informed by witnesses from the railway Department that the only way in which the northern suburbs system can be made to earn a profit is to continue the line from the back country through the heart of the suburban area into the central passenger station. I humbly submit this view, and remind to submit a proposal which I think will show conclusively how a large profit can be obtained.

When I had the honour of appearing before a previous Committee on this subject I alleged before them several suggestions differing from the plans submitted by the Railway Department, and one of these—a short loop to bring to the Preston traffic from the Merri Creek Bridge to Northcote-street—was approved of by that Committee, and has, I see, been adopted in the new plans submitted to this Committee. The section in cost being less than £30,000.

In response to a request from that Committee, I also submitted a proposal for a loop along Bally Street to bring in the Heidelberg and Collingwood traffic, and the evidence being called in, it is service to the whole of the northern suburbs over our central line. I would again submit that proposal, and the evidence is ready to show that it can be carried out for little more than half the amount estimated by the Department.

As my previous suggestion with regard to the Preston traffic has been adopted with such beneficial results, I now submit another, as market on this plan, to accommodate the traffic from Brunswick and Coburg in exactly similar lines.
and expert evidence will be placed before you to show that not only is this possible, but that it will give a great annual saving to the Department. The entire cost of this scheme, including property, would only be £10,000.

The proposal is to construct a loop, which will be only a few chains in length, from a point near the South Brunswick Street junction at the North Carlton Line, to enable the traffic to be brought to Flinders-street, rid Young-street, the requirements of both districts being thus met by the diversion of the existing service.

This plan shows how readily with these loops the whole of the north suburban traffic can be concentrated on to the central trunk line along Young-street, and with the most meritorious of all these routes is that every station on the whole of the existing lines is brought nearer to the central stations by it, so that the Flitree line in the most emphatic way establishes its claim to be the main direct route for those districts.

In many instances the saving in mileage is very remarkable. By this route the passenger at Nicholson-street would be only 2½ miles 10 chains away from Prince's-bridge, instead of 3 miles 10 chains as at present; for the passenger at North Carlton 3 miles 20 chains, instead of 2 miles 10 chains; Brunswick and Coburg would be brought 30 chains nearer the distance to Northcote and Preston would be reduced by 18½ miles, Northcote being reduced from 7½ miles to 4 miles, and Heidelberg from 6½ miles to 7½ chains, or a saving of no less than 3½ miles.

The change from the existing order circle system to the Young-street route would immediately render available thousands of tons of train space per annum, which are at present run to waste over unworkable sections from which little or no return can ever be hoped by.

I regard this utilisation of waste mileage as the key to the whole position. The Committee has already done excellently in bringing forth this plan, and I am glad of this opportunity of submitting a scheme which I am confident will secure attention, because it must revolutionise the whole suburban railway system, and which will give the Railway Department a source of profit, the possibilities of which it does not yet seem anyone has realised.

Expert evidence will be tendered to give you details of the saving in mileage and running cost which will be effected on the services at present run to Coburg, Preston, and Heidelberg. These services are of such a substantial character that they play a very important part in connection with the new route, and form an essential to the success and interest in construction submitted to you. I think these services will largely with the Committee. I may roughly to say that 24 trains at present run daily on the Coburg line, the 44 on the Preston line, and the 58 on the Coburg-Heidelberg, when diverted to the shorter Young-street route, will give mileage and rolling-stock for a very effective service over the new line.

The Department at present runs the mileage over a circular route where there is a sparse population and no choice of profit. We desire them to run it over a direct route, through the heart of a dense population, where they can get passengers and carry them at every station. From North Brunswick to Flinders-street, a distance of 2 miles 9 chains, is now covered by the Coburg line at a cost of 1s. 6d. per passenger, or 1s. 3½d. per passenger, when the line is extended to Heidelberg, and the same distance is covered by 22½ chains and 3½ chains of coal at a cost of ½d. per passenger, which is 1d. per passenger.

I think this comparison is point enough, and I will now proceed to tell you the Committee a detailed statement of the population affected by the new system.

I take strong exception to these figures placed before you by the Department with regard to population, especially as these figures, selected in a haphazard fashion, are used as the basis for computing and comparing the profit-giving capacity of the routes submitted to you. The Engineer-in-Chief informed the Committee that a railway would gather traffic from a distance of half a mile or three-quarters of a mile on either side. The Young-street line runs through the centre of Flitree, and must be more than a mile, and 3½ miles from any other direct public conveyance, yet the Department limited the area of its influence to the 29,000 population which Flitree itself possesses. The real position is as follows: when the Committee considered the Engineer-in-Chief and Traffic Manager with regard to the area of influence of a single line. Then Mr. Reilly stated that he believed the Flitree line would gather passengers from the east practically as far as Heidelberg-street, as they would be going towards their destination, but he would not commit himself to say how far the Young-street route would draw traffic the destination of which is in the opposite direction to the line.

Mr. Reilly, in answer to the same question, said that the Flitree line would serve 10,000 of the population of Collingwood in addition to the 20,000 in Flitree.

The whole of the figures seemed to have been based upon the assumption that the Collingwood man is to travel 28 times and the Flitree man is to travel only 50 times at 1½ each, and that gives you the revenue; the real facts are that about the 10,000 should be added to the 20,000, that would make one line 29,000 on their own showing, and leave Collingwood 27,000.

In this arbitrary fashion the Young-street route was made to show as less as compared with the Hoddle-street route, whereas, as a matter of fact, as so instructed by the Committee the figures should have been reversed.

The Metropolitan Board have issued a very handy sheet bringing you up to 1856, which gives the number of passengers in each city, and the number of passengers for every entry, and so that you cannot get anything more accurate. Taking the city of Flitree, you find that Flitree has 7,070 passengers. There are a very small portion of Flitree on Colliford Hill that is really served by the Collingwood line, and we deducted the portion served by the Collingwood line and give the credit for that, leaving for the Flitree line, a population of 26,604 served by the line. The Collingwood division from Smithfield to Wellington-street has 1,559 houses, or 6,526 persons. On the Carlton side, taking in Smithfield, we have 571 houses, or 2,284 persons. In East Melbourne, we have 105 tenements, and 422 persons, a total number of tenements, 930, and a population of 37,744. We again from Northcote the entire population. They have 1,896 houses, and a population of 7,265. Preston we take the whole of, because it must travel by that line, 811 houses, or a population of 3,125. The gross total so far to be served by the Flitree line is 47,384. We now get to the portion called North Carlton, for which there has been absolutely no population made, and we got from the sources of the highest class of population. Here you have a dense population and a good class of houses. In North Carlton, from Richardson-street to Park-street, you have 850 tenements, or a population of 3,436. In Brunswick East, from Park-street to 28 chains north, there are 998 houses, and a population of 3,436, giving together, 1,897 houses, and 7,478 people, on a gross total of 17,573 tenements, and a population of 55,462. We now come to the new part that we suggest to you, which is by this new curve. There we have the whole of the business thoroughfare of Brunswick. We get 9,534 houses or a population of 10,132. We get in Coburg, within 23 chains of the line, 4,124 house, or 3,258 persons, which can be largely increased by taking in the entire population of both those districts, making, up to date, a population of 98,862. To that has got to be added the population of Epping, 46 houses or 1,844 persons, and Whittlesea, 350 houses or 1,400 population, or a total of 72,166 upon that line. Then we come to the valuation of property in the district. The annual value of property in the city of Flitree per tenement averages £31 10s. Collingwood £22, so we have practi- cally 29 10s. more of annual value per tenement than they have. If the loop line along Reilly-street was adopted, and you brought in by that loop line the Heidelberg traffic we then got the population of Albion, Forest, Flitree, and Heidelberg—4,386. We get from the centre of Collingwood—at the station called Goldstreet—4,960 souls, or a gross population
to be served of 8,454. Having given you the Fitzroy line it is only fair we should give you the same
detail with regard to the Collingwood line. With the Collingwood line we give this advantage—that we
give them on the side next to ourselves 31 claims, and on the opposite side we give them 35 claims as
against our 28. In every case it will be found that we extend to Collingwood a greater area than we
do to the side of Richmond. If we carry all of it on the side of Richmond the Collingwood line contains
5,718 tenements with a population of 29,861. From that you have to take the portion to
Wellingt.on-street already served by the Fitzroy line, and the portion that cannot be served by any line.
That leaves 23,041. The portion of Richmond served up the Collingwood line 28 claims along the line
extending back to Richmond-paddle, close to the Swan-street station, contains 4,552. In East Melbourne
they get 518 houses and 2,672 people, and in Jolimont we give them the entire area—97 houses and a
population of 398, so that for their line we can only get a population of 29,631 as against the
population we have given for the Fitzroy line. The St. Kilda line has been held up to us as one of the lines that
can will have to be compared with. That line is held up to us as a pattern and yet we only get from there
20,458 of a population within a 28-chimney radius, so that we submit in asking you to construct this line
and loop and to listen to expert evidence we are justified in saying that it will be the greatest paying suburban
line in the city. At the present time there is no line that serves so dense a population as 80,000.

I submit to the Committee a detailed statement showing the number of tenements and the population residing
along the various lines within such a very reasonable distance that I think no one will deny that they are well within
the area of influence. I would point out that in the case of the Young-street route I have taken 29 claims along the
western side of the track from the southern boundary of Fitzroy along North Colling and Brunswick to Coburg. On the
 eastern side I have divided the distance between the Young-street route and the Middle-street route, the meeting point
being the centre of Wellington-street, Collingwood, a distance of 38 claims from Young-street, which includes Smith-street
and the business portion of Collingwood. In the case of the Hubbert-street route, I have included the entire area east of the
line to the Yarra, averaging 35 claims from the line, the only portion omitted being the southern section east of Church-
street, which exceeds that distance. The portion of Richmond included is greater in proportion than the area of influence taken
in the case of the Young-street route, coming as far south as Richmond paddle, halfway down the hill to the Swan-street station.
On the western side I give the Hubbert-street route the benefit of all Jolimont and a considerable portion of East Melbourne
between those north of the Swan-street station in this case. These returns have been compiled with regard to what was
announced by the Metropolitan Board of Works affected areas, showing number of tenements, population, density,
and valuations. From this it will be seen that not only does the Young-street route serve a very much larger population, but
that the whole of the planning in Collingwood, as shown by the average valuation per tenement, is of much more substantial
character. And this is a very safe guide with regard to the probable earning capacity of the lines.
The valuation of Fitzroy avenges 84 items. per tenement; Collingwood, 82.

These returns can be relied on by the Committee as accurate in every respect, as every street, and the number of
tenements in it, have been honored. And the papers which I now hand to the Committee show the whole of the details for every
street. They are, therefore, the best guide to the earning capacity of the Young-street route, the topographical
estimate put before the Committee by the Department, and I venture to say that this information, and the trouble which we
have been at to place before you before the Committee, must convince you that we are not only the most of the
persons who have been in the Young-street route, and desire only the cheapest and most searching inquiry into its capacity to serve the
northern suburbs and to earn a profit. You will see there is a great saving in the distances by this particular route, and if we have the line
constructed through Fitzroy so to serve the northern districts it must be a great advantage. There is no line
south of the Yarra that can show the same amount of population, and who have waited there for years
for the construction of a line as if this line is constructed it will pay from the very moment of
its construction; there can be no doubt about it.

194. By the Chairman.—The contention is that the lines will never pay on account of the number of
tramway lines going through the district. You never said one syllable as to the tram interferences—as long
as you could show that Collingwood was second to Fitzroy that was all you did!—I would be very
sorry for you to look at it in that way. I do not think your remarks justify you in saying that. I show
a scheme that is well worth the attention of the Department. I do not desire to say an ill word of
Collingwood.

195. Your statement went to show that Fitzroy would pay and Collingwood would not pay, and
that the Brunswick and Coburg line would not pay, but it would if connected with Fitzroy. Those
statements are in opposition to the statements of the Department!—Yes, I desire them to be so.

196. But do you wish us to believe your statement and disbelieve the statement of the Department?—No; I
do not think I would like you to do that. I ask you to make the most searching inquiry. We will place
before you expert evidence equal to any in the Department to prove the truth of the statements made today before you.
We can see every go further than that.

197. We would like to know how far the people to the west of the Fitzroy line would travel to the Fitzroy line in the event of its being constructed?—I agree with the evidence of the Engineer-in-Chief—three-quarters of a mile. If I was living in in that extreme end and could get a monthly ticket for 5s. a month, I would travel a mile to the line. Every time I come down to town it costs 6d. If I had a monthly ticket within 2 miles it would be 6s. per month, or 6s. 6d. for three months.

198. Suppose the people of Brunswick-street had this Young-street line, at what stations would they leave the line?—There are stations provided all along the line, with the exception of one at Alfred-
crescent, and we do not have to meet with that.

199. Starting at Reilly-street and taking the whole of the population between Brunswick-street and
South-street, where would they leave the railway?—Some might leave at Johnston-street, others at
Geelong-street. I reckon that is going to be one of the best-paying stations in Victoria. It is within a
little more than a quarter of a mile of the Exhibition Building, which is a vast gathering ground for sports
of all kinds, and if there was an interchange of traffic between the existing lines and our north suburban
lines, people would come larger distances and at greater ease than they do now. The Exhibition Building
is rapidly taking up the Melbourne Cricket Ground and taking its place.

200. Referring to the travelling population from Reilly-street towards the city, where would they get out?—I presume some would go down to their business in Melbourne, some would go to their avocations in various districts, and others would take their place and come and tend with us.

201. If the population of the whole proportion of the population of the northern suburbs, or of the whole of the whole of the population of the northern suburbs or the northern suburbs, or the north of the city, would go to the Fitzroy or to the Young-street line, and come to the centre of the city?—They do that now in the other suburbs. It seems to me that the tramway and a railway are a great attraction for the public over any other covenances. The tram line is a magni-
ificent means of locomotion, but when a man once gets a periodical ticket upon his watch chain he very
seldom takes it off.
925. Would there be sufficient travelling by rail as well as those who travel by tram — I think so. There is a large body of people who would travel if they had a cheaper means of doing it. Into Fitzroy, we have only in a minute's service, and we often start to walk down to the city, and many would travel there the last to travel. If the train started at a certain time you would lose yourselves to catch that train, but with the tram you cannot do it.

926. Is there a sufficient number of people to pay the railway who are not travelling by tram at all now — I believe there is.

927. You do not think it would take away from the tram — Traveling is a thing that grows; that is the result in every country. You can educate people to travel. My own opinion is that it will not injure the trams to anything like the extent they think. In every place south of the Yarra where there is a tram route at present there is a railway section.

928. Are you yourself interested in the tram? — I have not a share of any kind.

929. Are you indirectly interested in the tram? — Not in the most remote way.

930. Not as a councillor of the city of Fitzroy? — No, certainly not. The trams have an accumulated saving of £20,000 to meet their millions and a half of liability.

931. Do you not consider my apprehension that the municipalities will be burdened with them? — No. When the tramway was built in Glasgow two years ago, the first thing they did was to reduce the fares by one-third, increase the wages of the working men by one-third; on the same basis, increase the fares in every way, and yet, they have yielded a vast profit. I believe there is no way against the tram; I think it is a magnificent service, but I do not think that will interfere with the railway in any way.

932. By Mr. Curr. — Do you think the people of Brunswick would object to being brought into town in that way? — I do not think any man would object to being brought in by a shorter route and better service.

933. Do you know Millar's scheme? — Yes; there is nothing in it. It runs diagonally across the great belt of the city, and I do not think you would tolerate an overland railway through the city. I think it will be just as costly, because it will be a viaduct practically all the way. I do not think there is anything in the scheme, and I do not think it would be an earning line. I do not think it would accommodate the masses.

934. By Mr. J.S. White. — There are a great number of people whom it costs 6d. a day to come into town; if there were hundreds or thousands too same as yourself, that would reduce the tram earnings. — Not to any great extent. I believe there would be some great number of people and it would not be so limited.

935. Have you considered what amount the tram would lose? — No. There is a large population that cannot afford to travel at the present time.

936. Has Fitzroy lost much population in the last twelve months? — We are gaining a little now. Some of the population lost in the last twelve months, we don't.

937. By the Hon. D. Melville. — Do you think the track through Fitzroy is the best? — That is the best.

938. The time-table submitted by Mr. Fitzpatrick is three minutes to Grey-street, and five minutes to Fitzroy; will that time-table bring as that great traffic that exists in Fitzroy? — Yes, certainly it will.

939. We will be in a position to get the traffic you have spoken of if we adopt this track? — I think so.

940. By Mr. Harris. — You said Fitzroy would pay better than Collingwood, but there is a tram service satisfying the public. To some extent. In considering whether or not a further railway should be constructed we will have to consider how far they are served by tram — There is a large proportion of the public at the present time who cannot afford to pay 6d. a day for travelling; that proportion would avail themselves of a monthly ticket and travel at the tram rates you can travel on the northern lines. It does not seem to interfere with the tram traffic there. Take the tram line to Prahran, it is one of the best paying lines, and yet they have three stations along the line. There is a large proportion in every district that take monthly tickets, and you can educate them to travel more.

941. In your calculation you have taken a certain distance from the existing railway, but your particulars do not show how far the people served by an existing railway or the tram are from the proposed railway? — Not further than 20 chains. The stations are about half a mile apart. It is less than 50 chains now.

942. The railways withdraw.

James Greig, sworn and examined.

943. By the Chairman. — What are you? — An electrician, residing in Fitzroy, and a councillor of the city of Fitzroy. I have been in Fitzroy 27 years.

944. Do you feel the want of a railway? — Very much so. I should not have agitated for the last fifteen years otherwise. I am one of the committee appointed by the Council to give evidence before the Committee. I simply raise all that Mr. McMahon has advanced.

945. You were in Fitzroy before they started the agitation for the tram system? — Yes.

946. Did you oppose it at this time? — No, I was in favour of the tram.

947. You did not anticipate that it would injure your chances for a railway? — No, certainly not.

948. Why? — I consider the greater the facilities for travelling the more people will avail themselves of the opportunity. We have a proof of that in the fact that a few years ago, before the tram was introduced, the population was pretty much the same in Fitzroy, but there was not one-fifth the number of people residing there that there is now. The old bus system would not be a better one if we put it back into Fitzroy now.

949. You are satisfied that the railway would not injure the tram traffic materially? — I say so; much encouragement would be given to travelling that there would be an extra number travelling, and the trams would not suffer from any material extent. At present a great many, who are glad to rise at 7 a.m., stay 30 minutes, and then walk a long distance to get it.
947. Do you sell farm produce?—Yes, houses and land, and other commodities.
948. You cannot judge as to the quality of produce that comes in from the country to Fitzroy?—A large quantity of produce comes, but I cannot say to what extent.
949. Mr. McEachen stated this was purely a passenger line; do you think any goods or produce would be sent from Fitzroy all by it?—Certainly. We have one merchand in Fitzroy now whose account is about £3,000 a year with the Railway Department for freight on produce.
950. Would all that come round to his place?—Most of it, I presume.
951. Do you not know to what extent it deals with the northern districts to the back of Fitzroy?
—No, but I know for 30 years he has had large connections that way.

The witness withdrew.

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

THURSDAY, 15th OCTOBER, 1896.

Moderator present:

Mr. Cameron, in the Chair;

The Hon. D. Melville, M.L.C.;
The Hon. E. McClyne, M.L.C.;

Mr. Burton,
Mr. Craven,
Mr. Horsn,
Mr. J. S. White.

William Hall Owen, sworn and examined.

952. By the Chairman—You are mayor of South Melbourne?—I am.
953. What are your reasons for opposing these proposed lines?—I believe they will not be of advantage to the public for a long time that the trams are now in that and every district, I think the construction of these lines would take away the profits of the trams, and yet would not pay for themselves for a considerable period, and so the one scheme would spell the other. That would reduce our assets in prospect. We look upon the tramway asset as a very valuable one in prospect. That is our chief objection to the construction of these lines.
954. Do you approve to-day in support of the tram's interest?—I do.
955. Have you any shares in the tramway company?—I have none.
956. Do you think if the northern lines were constructed it would injure the trams?—I think so, considerably.
957. Do you not take into consideration the convenience of the people of the northern districts?—I do, but I think they are very well supplied through the operations of the tramway system, and I think we ought to look to ourselves and our asset as well as our city.
958. Is South Melbourne interested in a city?—Yes, we look forward to this tramway system in some twenty years being a valuable asset.
959. You want to increase the value of that asset as the expense and inconvenience of the people in the north?—No, certainly not; but I maintain that they have every convenience now in that neighborhood. People who used to go by train in other suburbs have left the trains and go by the trams, because they are more convenient, and put them down at positions more convenient to themselves. I can cite scores of families who have done that in South Melbourne. I have not been to towns in the train for years, because the tram is more convenient, and I am one of many.
960. Then the trains on the south side of the river ought to be stopped?—No, they suit a certain proportion of the population, and they have to be looked to as well.
961. What population do they serve in the southern districts?—Those immediately contiguous to the various stations. I cannot say the number.
962. Can you tell us the number that travel by rail and the number that travel by train in the northern suburbs?—I cannot give the numbers, but I know the numbers are very considerable on the tram lines.
963. Can you give the population in the northern suburbs?—Not of my own knowledge.
964. Are you acquainted with the localities north of the city?—Yes, I am so; I am far acquainted with them as most people. I am constantly about there.
965. Can you tell the population in a given area, say between South-road and Hoddle-road, and Victoria-parade and Reilly-street?—No, I know it is densely crowded there, and they are served very well by the trams. Of course, there are points where a railway would serve them better, no doubt. They have the Victoria-street, and the Brunswick-street, the Grange-road, and the Nicholson-street trams.
966. Taking that particular area of country I have mentioned, how are they served?—They are served very well. They have to travel to get to the Victoria-street tram, the Brunswick-street tram, and so on. They would not be served so well by the trams in that area as they probably would by a station there.
967. Do you know North Carlton and East Fitzroy?—Yes.
968. How are they supplied with trams?—The tram runs along Elgin-street and Drummond-street.
969. They are supplied very fairly.
970. Do you know the distance between Elgin-street and the Brunswick boundary?—I know there is a considerable area there, and the tram passes through there and Drummond-street and Elgin-street, and right along to North Carlton.
971. What is the distance between Elgin-street and the Royal Park railway?—I suppose it must be a couple of miles.
972. You think it is quite convenient for those people to come to the tram?—No, I say in some instances it would be more convenient to have a railway; but, generally speaking, it is.
973. Would you like in South Melbourne to have to travel a mile to reach a tram?—No. Besides, when you do go by tram you often have to go a mile to get where you want to, whereas the tram stops you within a yard or two.
973. Have any more lines of railway been built in those suburbs since the trams have been constructed?—No, I do not think so.

974. Then the Tramways Company constructed those trams with their eyes open to compete against the railways?—Certainly.

975. You think the people have no right to a railway in the northern districts?—We think the railways, unless it is of common benefit to the public, will interfere with an asset we have already established.

976. Whether the railway would pay or not?—If the railway would pay and serve the public very much better, then I should build it; but it appears to me that for many years they will not pay, and they will destroy an existing enterprise.

977. Do you agree with the estimates of the Railway Department as to the returns of the proposed railway?—They say one line will pay, and the other will not for some time. I agree that eventually that will be the case; and in so doing we shall be injured in our results and prospects.

978. Do you know anything of the back country to the north?—I know something of it, not very much.

979. I know they have brought the line to Heidelberg, and they might go further than that.

980. Where should it go; would you ask them to go 5 miles round?—Probably, when they are on the journey from such a distance, 5 miles round would not be such a hardship.

981. Supposing we asked the people in South Melbourne to go down to Port Melbourne and round to Melbourne, you would not like it?—No.

982. In the northern districts they can go where they like?—No. They have this line already there, and at present it seems to me the two lines coming through Collingwood and Fitzroy should be dispensed with.

983. By the Hon. J. Moloney. Are you here with the consent and resolution of the council?—I am.

984. Your principal objection is the difficulty of the tramway; it will injure an asset?—I think it will injure them.

985. Do you know the rate of the tramway account at present?—I do not know the exact state; I know it is not as good as it might be, and ought to be.

986. When you arrive at the conclusion it will damage the tramways, do you know anything about the state of the tramways?—I cannot give you the figures, but I consider that the trams now are not in the position they should be.

987. How do you know that?—By seeing the returns from time to time: they are lower and lower.

988. Have we any money invested towards the liquidation of the trams?—There is money invested; I cannot say how much.

989. If that asset fell in now, would it be very much advantage to us?—Not now; the thing is not paying well enough at present.

990. Can you show the Committee that it is not paying?—No, but I say it is not paying as well as it ought to do.

991. Are the suburban railways of South Melbourne paying?—Not as well as they ought to do, or as well as they used to. The tramways have injured them considerably.

992. It was the railway that developed your town?—Yes.

993. The tramways came in on the railway; not the railways on the tramways?—Yes.

994. Has the place improved since both have been running together?—Yes, both do a certain amount of good.

995. Then the two things combined have developed the place?—Yes.

996. Why should they not do so in Fitzroy?—They may do so in time.

997. Do you know the rate of development since the railways and trams ran together?—I cannot tell you that. Lately we have fallen off, but we got up £8,000 or £10,000 increase in our rates.

998. Have you not disputed?—We have disputed since the railway came into existence.

999. Have you not stuck?—I do not think so.

1000. What is your assessment now?—£36,500. I think. It used to be £42,500.

1001. Before the tram came in and the railways ran above, did you not improve by leaps and bounds?—We did improve considerably.

1002. Do you wish the Committee to prohibit what has developed you? Fitzroy demands the same conditions as have developed your municipality; do you wish to refuse that?—Certainly, when they have the accommodation by going a little further round. It was not there in the other instances.

1003. Mr. Fitzpatrick and the Engineer-in-Chief say that the people residing in Fitzroy and North Fitzroy can reach the centre of Melbourne in three minutes, five minutes, and seven minutes respectively, and at present the State has to drag them right round the circle for 24 and 26 minutes. Do you wish to inflict that punishment on these people for all time?—Certainly not for all time.

1004. What is the meaning of the opposition?—Because we think it will destroy our valuable asset in the future.

1005. You have shown that that asset is absolutely a gain, that we have got £300,000 in a sinking fund?—I have not shown that.

1006. You believe it?—I believe it, but I cannot give figures, other people can give figures.

1007. You have not shown that the suburban railways have diminished your assets?—No: I have given you my opinion.

1008. Is your council seriously affected by what is to happen twenty years hence?—Those that come after in the council might be affected.

1009. Is that an argument that you wish the Committee to consider, that this opposition of yours is for something that is to happen twenty years hence?—Yes, partly, and partly we think the existing scheme is sufficient.

1010. You say if the Government shut up the railways it would not do you any good?—I did not say that. I said it would not do for us to go to Port Melbourne in going to Melbourne. It would be
allowing the present state of things. You have certain accommodation in this district as auxiliary in the shape of a line that is very inconvenient no doubt, but it is better than nothing.

1011. Are you serious in saying that you desire to inflict upon the people of Fitzroy the necessity of 21 minutes when 15 minutes will do? I do not think about 15 minutes, when it is all.

1012. You say they will get in in five, six, and nine minutes; so they would if they lived contiguous to the various stations, but some people have to travel across tram tracks to get to the various stations. They would not cross the tram; they would get on the tram; that is what would make the railway pay today.

1013. If there is documentary evidence that there will be a profit on one, would you construct the one there is a profit on?—I would.

1014. If it is paid, you would withdraw your opposition?—I do not know that the council would.

1015. If the Committee see that this line will pay, you withdraw your opposition?—No: I say if the line is going to pay from the very first, and to have immense benefit to the northern suburbs, if the others have been to other suburbs, I should not be so strong against it.

1016. If it is to be of immense benefit to those suburbs your opposition is gone?—Personally it is, I do not know if the council would take the same view of it.

1017. By Mr. Birtax.—What is the nature of the objections by your council?—There are two objections, one that the introduction of these lines will interfere with the assets that we have in prospect; the other is that they think that the district is fairly supplied under the existing scheme of tramways, and there is no absolute necessity for those lines.

1018. Taking the Collingwood country, can you say what lines of tramway run through Collingwood?—The Act-street tram runs along Gertrude-parade, and terminates at Victoria-bridge. There is one that runs along Gertrude-street right through Collingwood to the Heidelberg-road, through the heart of Collingwood and Fitzroy. There is also one in Johnston-street, which terminates at the river.

1019. There is a large space between Johnston-street and Gertrude-street where there are no tram at all, taking in Wellington-street, Eccles-street, and all the part to the east; do you think these people are served by the trams in Victoria-parade and Smith-street sufficiently well?—Not sufficiently well; I did not say they were supplied sufficiently well; I say they are supplied tolerably well. To be sufficient would require fresh lines in various directions. I consider they are fairly well supplied, I have not found it very burdensome.

1020. Look at the space bounded on the south by Johnston-street, on the west by Smith-street, and away out to the Heidelberg-road, and to the river; will this be of benefit to you?—That is a large space of ground. Is there any tram in that?—There is not one running through it, but there is one adjacent to it going to Clifton Hill.

1021. Do you think they are fairly provided with conveniences for getting to Melbourne?—They are worse provided than the other parts.

1022. As far as the Collingwood line is concerned, those people would be greatly benefited if a line was carried through there?—They would be benefited certainly.

1023. They are not at present fairly provided for in that locality?—I do not think they are fairly provided there. That seems to be the worst part of the district.

1024. Do you think the people between Johnston-street, Victoria-parade, Smith-street, and the river are fairly provided for?—They are not better provided for than the other parts you have just referred to. I think they are fairly provided for. I have had to go a good deal there with the trams. They have suited me very well, and would suit most people.

1025. Going to the east and looking at the Fitzroy tram, you have a line in Smith-street going to the Heidelberg-road. You have another in Brunswick-street going north to the station at North Fitzroy. You have another in Nicholson-street running away to the north. Do you think those people are fairly well provided for by those lines?—I do.

1026. What is the section of tramway do you see going east and west in that locality?—There is Johnston-street, and Gertrude-street and Victoria-parade.

1027. Looking at that, do you think those people are well provided for?—I think so, fairly well provided.

1028. What interest has your council got in this matter of the trams?—When the tram expires we shall have a proportionate amount of interest compared with the other municipalities.

1029. On what condition will you acquire that interest?—It will be made free of charge to the rate-payers?—No.

1030. How will you acquire the interest?—Each municipality, I understand, will have a proportionate amount of the value of the tramways then in existence.

1031. Will it be given you for nothing?—I do not suppose so.

1032. You will have the right to buy the tram?—No, we shall have the right to become owners of them.

1033. How will you become owners?—By Act of Parliament, I suppose.

1034. When will the municipalities acquire the tram system?—I suppose each municipality will acquire them by Act of Parliament. These have to be some payment of course. I only know that we do look upon it as an asset in the future.

1035. You do not know the particulars of the agreement?—I do not. I have not looked into it.

1036. Has your council considered these lines from a municipal point of view?—I suppose they have. They debated it and came to the conclusion I have outlined, that they thought they ought to oppose it.

1037. Is it not selfish to say that because it will be to our interest to prevent it we will oppose it?—This is not a national thing; it is a good thing.

1038. If you were not mayor of South Melbourne, and this system was shown to be an advantage to the people and to be a profitable thing, would you still object?—I am of the opinion that it was to be a profitable thing from the beginning I should withdraw my personal objection to it.

1039. Have your council viewed it from that point of view?—I do not know. I think they took the selfish consideration into account; they wanted to protect their own interests.
1039. Your council offer no objection from a national point of view at all—they have not authorized you to express that opinion?—They have not authorized me to express any opinion, except that they object to it from a local point of view.

1040. By the Hon. E. Merry.—Have your council taken into consideration that the people north of Fitzroy have a right to have some consideration?—Yes, many of them said they thought it was hard on them, but they had already in existence a line; no doubt it was inconvenient, but still it was there.

1041. Have you taken into consideration what the city which you represent would be if it had not feeders to feed centres?—I should say it would be in a poor way.

1042. Is it not selfish on the part of your council to oppose this scheme?—It may be selfish. The feeders from the country to the Outer Circle lines are a very desirable thing. I concede that those lines are very desirable.

1043. Are the people of the city indebted to the country people for keeping the great centre up?—I admit that.

1044. Have you discussed the matter in council?—Yes.

1045. Taking Fitzroy and Collingwood out altogether, did you discuss the rights the people had beyond, to the north and north-east?—Yes; they said they thought it was very hard upon those northern residents, but they had, at some inconvenience, some accommodation by a longer route that they could get to the city. They are not absolutely shut out from the advantages of the city.

1046. Those people were there before South Melbourne was thought of?—No doubt.

1047. Surely your council will not think of doing those people an injury?—I do not suppose they would like to do them an injury, but they can get to a line which will bring them in with a certain amount of inconvenience. If you want to put them on an equality, the Outer Circle line is not the proper way to bring them to the city.

1048. Is it not the duty of the different councils to try and assist all country places?—Assuredly it is. I quite agree that every portion of the country should have every advantage it can get.

1049. A person knows how much is produced for 50 or 60 miles to the north?—Yes, it is an enormous amount, and I recognise the fact that they should have more advantageous methods of getting to the city than they have.

1050. The nearer they can bring their produce to the centre the more cheaply you can get it?—Yes, I have not lost sight of that personally; but I am expressing the views of my council.

1051. By the Hon. D. Melville.—You have two railways?—Yes.

1052. You are about 23 miles away from the Post Office at Middle Park; Fitzroy and Collingwood are about the same distance. The proposal is to give each of those a railway, and they will be the same distance from the centre of the city as you are. If we can attain this without losing to the State and without loss to the tramway, what is your verdict?—I should be in favour of it certainly.

1053. By the Chairman.—Do you know the population of South Melbourne, including Albert Park?—It is 35,530, I think.

1054. Do you know how many trips per head they travel by tram and railway?—No. I think the tramway people would give that information.

1055. It is 48 by rail and 57 by tram; that is 105 out of a population of 35,112. The population of Collingwood and Fitzroy is 67,000 and they only make 92 journeys per head, that is less than the 105 on the south. If the rest of the population went by rail they would not injure the trams. There would be as many again by the railway—I do not think there would be as many again.

1056. Why do they not go by tram?—They are economically I suppose and walk.

1057. Have you read the evidence given by the railway witnesses?—Yes.

1058. Mr. Fitzpatrick said the only hope he had of wiping out the deficit on the railways was to get those northern lines built?—Yes.

1059. Do you believe that?—I believe he knows more of those things than I do; I do not think I am capable of giving correct information on that point.

1060. Will the trams be done away with after twenty years?—I think not.

1061. Will not the people in the south at the beginning of the next twenty years have as much right to say that they are in possession of the trams and the lines will interfere with them, as they have now?—They might have a right to say it; they might not have the right to act upon it.

John Baragwanath, sworn and examined.

1062. By the Chairman.—What are you?—An auctioneer and estate agent, and a councillor in South Melbourne.

1063. You appear here to oppose the construction of the northern suburbs lines?—Yes.

1064. On what grounds?—We oppose it on various grounds. One reason might be called selfish, that were opposing it in the interests of the tram lines. We consider it would interfere with the value of the tram lines as an asset in twenty years. We also oppose it on national grounds. We consider the state of the country does not justify the expenditure. We are all taxed more or less in any expenditure the Government makes on railways.

1065. Do you know how the railways in the southern districts are paying?—I cannot give figures, but I do not think they are paying.

1066. Do the trams pay?—No.

1067. Do they pay nearly as well as they did seven or eight years ago?—I do not think so. We have a smaller population. People have not the money to spend. Our population used to be about 45,000, and I think we have 30,000 or 10,000 less than we had a few years ago.

1068. Are you of opinion that these lines should not be constructed for twenty years?—No. I consider the present time very inopportune. We have a falling population, the revenue is decreasing; we do not know what the population will be in five years, and to go and spend money in constructing public works at the present time, I think, is inadvisable.

1069. Do you know anything about the northern suburbs?—Yes, I know a little about them. I have been living in this country forty years.
1070. Do you think they are well accommodated for as travelling facilities are concerned?—They are not as well accommodated as we are by a long way; they might be far better accommodated.

1071. Do you think they are not entitled to that accommodation, because the country is not in a prosperous condition?—I do not think we are entitled to spend money unless we see that it will pay. I think they are morally as much entitled to a line as we are.

1072. You think they ought to be sacrificed to the benefit of the community?—We all have to make sacrifices for the benefit of the great community.

1073. Out of 3,500, each one travels 105 times a year either on a tram or on the railway?—I do not know how they travel.

1074. Is it not strange that with 67,900 on the north, they only travel 92 times per head—that is, double the population are not travelling as much as the others?—I suppose that is accounted for by the fact that if they had railways a lot of people would use them. The question is whether they would pay.

1075. Is it reasonable to suppose the railways are getting their share saw if half the population does not travel at all?—It is reasonable to suppose that at present a number of people are compelled to walk who under ordinary conditions would pay their fare by tram or train.

1076. Are the people on the south better off than the people on the north?—I dare say they are.

1077. Have you been through the northern districts lately?—Yes. My business takes me all round the place. I have been through there within the last six months.

1078. Taking the appearance of the place with its houses and the condition of the buildings, will it compare favourably with the south?—Yes, very favourably.

1079. Does that indicate prosperity?—No; I think it is a sort of relic of the past. If we built according to existing conditions, those houses would not be there.

1080. Do you see streets a mile long there that were not constructed seven years ago?—I suppose from 1889 to 1890 a great number of buildings did go up, but building has practically ceased since then.

1081. Would you believe that there is another place in the colony of Victoria with as many well built newly built houses as North Fitzroy?—I know a great many houses have sprung up in that direction in the last ten years.

1082. How can that be a relic of the past?—It was done during the land boom when people moved out there.

1083. By the Hn. D. Melville.—Are you afraid the railways will not pay?—I think we have a very poor guarantee at present, considering the state of the country.

1084. That is your chief difficulty?—That is one of our reasons.

1085. Do you notice that the Engineer-in-Chief certified that the Collingwood line will pay the State?—I thought he said he would make a loss of £296 a year at first.

1086. Do you agree with Dr. Owen that if the Collingwood railway paid you would then advise its construction?—I should be disposed to say so.

1087. And the same thing applies to Fitzroy. If it appears from the evidence that it will be remunerative, you think it should be constructed?—I should be disposed to withdraw opposition then. I think it would be very selfish, indeed, to oppose the erection of a railway simply because we are interested in the trams, but as we are interested in the trams, and we think the railways will not pay, our opposition is all the stronger.

1088. At the end of a fixed period the trams come into the possession of the municipalities absolutely?—I think we have to take their liabilities if there are any.

1089. The trust gets possession of the whole property?—The trust only represents the municipalities.

1090. The theory is that by their sinking fund the purchase money will be provided by the end of that period?—Where does the sinking fund come in if there is undue competition?

1091. It is stated that we have already £200,000 invested against that liquidation. If the trams fell into our hands next month would it be any disadvantage to the municipalities?—Yes; I think it would cost more to work under the municipalities than under the present system.

1092. The management would be inferior?—I think it would be inferior and more expensive.

1093. You think the municipalities are not competent to manage the trams?—I do not think they would be for a few years.

1094. You think it would be a disadvantage if the trams fell in next year?—Yes. The Tramway Company can work off their liabilities better than we could, being thoroughly conversant with the working of the system.

1095. What will we do with them when they do come?—I think when they do come we will have no liability to take over.

1096. What is the total liability of the trams?—£1,600,000, less the sinking fund.

1097. South Melbourne has a share of that liability?—Yes.

1098. Has Fitzroy?—I presume so.

1099. And Collingwood and Brunswick?—Yes.

1100. Two populations nearly as big as yours are also liable. They have also a little interest in them?—Undoubtedly, but they have a double interest; the amount lost in the railway would fall upon the whole colony, so their amount of liability compared with the good done by the railway would be infinitesimal.

1101. You have two railways. You are the same distance from the centre of the city as Fitzroy and Collingwood, and this proposal is merely to give these people a short cut to the city?—Yes. I think if we had not a railway we would not build one at the present time.

1102. When did the railway come to South Melbourne?—In the early fifties. The Government did not build that line. The Government purchased from the Holman’s Bay Railway Company.

1103. Was it paying then?—I think it was paying better then than now. I cannot give the figures.

1104. Did the tramways injure it?—Yes, they must have done.

1105. Who lost by that?—I presume the Government; they must have lost by it.

1106. Then Fitzroy lost a portion of that and Collingwood lost a portion of that?—Yes; but we offer special facilities to the people of Fitzroy and Collingwood to come in by tram.
1107. Is there any reason in the natural order of events why you should have special privileges in the north more than they have in the south?—I think when the Tramway Company built their lines they built them under the existing conditions at the time.

1108. Were railways there, and paying railways?—Yes, but they were prepared to make a loss there. It would be rather selfish to run tramways in one particular locality and shut out others.

1109. Are your railways in a great factor in the development of the place?—They have undoubtedly been in the past.

1110. If Fitzroy had a railway would it not have progressed by leaps and bounds?—I think they would have had it rob somebody else to increase their population.

1111. Have you reduced any one else?—Yes, I think we did at one time. We all rob somebody when we look after our interests.

1112. Is your council unanimous on the point?—I think we had thirteen against the lines and two in favour.

1113. Thirteen of your council have voted that the people of Fitzroy shall travel 26 minutes when they ought to do it in seven?—No. Our council feel that at the present time it is very important to construe railways that are simply a speculation.

1114. You say your place has developed immensely both by streets and railways?—I do not say the towns have developed the place. No doubt the railways did a lot of good.

1115. Is not the geographical position of the north the same as the position of your municipality?—No, it is not as good. We are close to the place and the river.

1116. By Mr. Currey,—Taking South Melbourne, in the case of people who live nearer to a railway station than to a tram, which do they take?—It all depends upon their pockets as to which is the best. Where a man can afford to ride by tram I think he does so. If he cannot afford it, the railway is more economical.

1117. Do you prefer the tram?—I do not know that he does. I prefer the tram myself; other people may prefer the railway.

1118. By the Hon. E. Money.—You say if you had a railway in the south now, you would not advocate making them free?—Not at the present time.

1119. You do not think North Fitzroy is in the same position as the south?—As far as the back country and this fruit industry is concerned we have not that advantage. We have nothing to grow.

120. You have nothing but passengers. Putting Fitzroy on one side and assuming it is well provided with trams, there is all that back country that has been inhabited for 40 or 50 years, and under high cultivation. Have they not a right to get their produce to the market?—Yes. The question is whether the amount of produce raised justifies a railway. We are told that from Becceworth you can fetch produce down as cheap by trams as by rail; that might apply in this case also.

121. Did the railways settle the people on the country?—I admit that.

122. Have not those people that have been settled 40 or 50 years a right to a railway?—We think they are having the place, we do not think they are getting there.

123. Have they not as much right to have a railway through this country as through Gippsland?—Morally one class of people have as much right as another, but it comes back to the question whether under the existing conditions the expenditure is justified. You produce grain and other things in the north that we do not produce in the south; but I say existing conditions do not justify, in the opinion of my council, the expenditure that would be necessary.

124. Would not your council get the benefit of it through getting the stuff cheaper into market?—If there is a heavy outlay to get the railway I do not know that we will benefit by it in the long run.

The witness withers.

Talbot Hamilton, sworn and examined.

125. By the Chairman.—What are you?—Secretary of the Tramways Trust.

126. Did you send circulars to all the municipalities asking them to oppose these lines?—Yes, the Trust sent them to all the municipalities represented on the Trust.

127. What are the functions of the Trust?—They were called into existence to construct the tramways. They represent all the municipalities interested in the tramways. They leased the tramways to the company on a lease expiring in July, 1916. It ran from 1984 to 1916.

128. Did they make any provision to put money by to meet the liabilities?—Yes, the Tramway Company pay the Trust every year the interest on debentures, and a sinking fund that will extinguish the loan by the end of the lease.

129. Have the company kept up the payments to the present?—Yes.

130. At the end of the 32 years will there be any liabilities?—No, if the company can pay its way.

131. The Trust get the property for nothing at the end of the lease?—Yes.

132. Do you know anything about the company?—Nothing more than what is published, we do not get any figures from the company.

133. Do you know what is paid up on the shares?—Ten shillings a share on 900,000 shares, making £90,000.

134. What is the amount of each share?—£1.

135. Do you think at the end of the time the municipalities will take the management or re-lease them to the company?—I do not know. That is to be decided twenty years hence. I think it is very likely they will lease clean.

136. Is the Trust very anxious for the twenty years to expire so as to get the management?—Yes, if the tramways succeed. They would not like to succeed to a bankrupt concern.

137. What would be the consequences if the company failed to carry on?—It would be a very serious matter. It has only lately been brought to our notice as a possibility. We have always thought they were a very valuable asset, but if the company fail in their engagements it would mean that the municipalities would succeed to a bankrupt concern.

138. There is half the capital to call up yet?—Yes.
1138. Have you any idea which lines pay the best?—Yes; not from personal knowledge, but from conversation, I have always understood that the Smith-street line, the Brunswick-street line, and the Johnston-street line are about the three best paying lines.

1140. Do you think that a railway through the northern suburbs would injure the property of the Trust?—From the evidence I have seen in the papers I think the railway authorities anticipate they will get a great deal of the traffic from the Trust.

1141. You agree with the railway authorities?—Yes; naturally you put competition alongside you will draw away some of the traffic.

1142. You agree with the railway authorities that one of three lines will pay from the start?—That is a matter the Trust have not gone into at all.

1143. Have you come to the conclusion that a population of 60,000 or 70,000 people in the north are not entitled to the accommodation that the people in the south have?—That was not considered by the Trust. Personally, I have no opinion on the subject. I have no data on which to form an opinion.

1144. The agitation for a railway has existed for many years. Neither the Trust nor the company opposed it until lately, who instigated this opposition?—I suppose they did not think the railway was in any immediate danger of being constructed until lately.

1145. When the Collingwood line was authorized in 1890 you did not think it necessary to take any steps? In 1890-91 the trains were doing very well. Every year since then the receipts have dropped considerably.

1146. You think the construction of these lines will injure the Trust?—I think there is no doubt of that.

1147. You think the people there should not be able to travel by train or rail the same as in the south side of the town?—If the railway reduces the fares very much the people will naturally travel by railway.

1148. How many constitute the Trust?—Eighteen members, representing twelve municipalities—Melbourne, Collingwood, Fitzroy, Richmond, Prahran, St. Kilda, Port Melbourne, Brunswick, North Melbourne, South Melbourne, Hawthorn, and Kew.

1149. How do you account for the fact that half the municipalities do not oppose the construction of these lines?—I believe Melbourne opposes them, which has for the largest interest in the matter. We did not expect that Collingwood and Fitzroy would oppose them. They are directly interested in their construction.

1150. By Mr. Harris.—They must think the railways would benefit them?—Yes, it might benefit them more than they would lose by the loss on the trains.

1151. Do Hawthorn and Kew oppose?—No, they are in favor of it. Richmond has not passed any resolution. St. Kilda is against it; Brunswick merely received our letter; North Melbourne is against them; Port Melbourne has taken no action.

1152. You have not a majority of the municipalities?—No. Some of them have taken no action at all. The circular of the Trust was written because the Trust, being representative of all the municipalities, thought it right to bring to their notice the likelihood of the system being damaged.

1155. By the Hon. Dr. McIvor.—Have you any figures to show the damage?—No, merely the fact that if you put a railway alongside a tram, the tram will be damaged.

1156. Did you ever inquire into the damage done to the railways by the tramways in South Melbourne. In 1884 it had a population of 28,000, and when both were built, the place went on by leaps and bounds?—I do not think the South Melbourne line pays.

1157. You had a revenue of $273,000 and a population of 28,000?—I do not think that was owing to the railways or the trams; they assisted, no doubt.

1158. And they both profit?—No; the trams do not pay.

1159. Seeing that the places developed enormously from the socket that you opened those lines, have you not helped to develop the place?—I suppose it has helped to develop.

1160. Those two railways and the tram have developed the place?—The question is are the trams paying?

1161. Have you got this £336,900 of a sinking fund?—That has come out of the Tramway Company.

1162. Who has paid that?—From the fares taken.

1163. That is towards the liquidation of the debt; has not the tramway been paying dividends?—It did not pay dividends for some years.

1164. What amount has been paid in dividends?—I do not know how much they paid. Some years they paid very good dividends; then they dropped down to nothing.

1165. You have got £336,900 out of the concern; is not that handsome?—It is what we contracted they should pay.

1166. It is invested?—Yes.

1167. Can you tell the amount that has been paid in dividends?—No.

1168. The dividends, taken with the liquidation payments, make a very handsome sum?—Yes.

1169. Have you any fear of this property coming into the hands of the Trust?—A few months ago I should have said it was the worst thing that could happen for the municipalities, but if you are brought face to face with the fact that there is a chance, by a line being built, of reducing the receipts of the company below working expenses, I should say there is a chance of our having to take over a bankrupt concern.

1170. Will the building of this line do you any harm?—I believe it will do us harm.

1171. Will it not be a developing agency to both of you?—I do not say that if the population doubled it would not pay.

1172. Was this circular sent out hurriedly?—No; it was carefully considered by the Trust.

1173. Are they shareholders in the tramway?—They cannot be, by Act of Parliament.

1174. You think they are really afraid that constructing two lines of railway would lessen the income of the Fitzroy line?—Yes.

1175. Did you personally believe in that?—I certainly think that constructing a line of railway along the tram will take some of the traffic—that is self-evident.
1174. Your part of the business is a handsome affair?—So far it has been. We shall pay off the liability and get possession of the lines.

1175. Suppose the £100,000 that is liable to be called up could not be called up, and the company threw up the undertaking, could you not manage to go on as well as the Tram Company is doing?—We might do as well, but I do not think the municipalities would be satisfied. They would be running at a loss if they had to call on my capital to work them.

1176. Is not this a sort of sinking horse?—No. If you take the last balance-sheet of the company I think you will see they are in a very dangerous position. Their total profits last year were only £25,000.

1177. All the contracts with the Tram Company have been connected advantageously and you have the handsome sum of £35,000 Growing up?—Yes.

1178. And in addition to that they have been paying handsome dividends for a long period?—I think they paid 5 per cent. for two years past. Before that they had a smaller capital, and paid a big dividend for a few years.

1179. Did they not pay bonuses?—Yes.

1180. Were a 2s. a share?—I forget; they were very large.

1181. You do not think there is any reason to be frightened whatever we do?—I do not know. The Trust say there is a very considerable danger. We think if you tap on our receipts will be reduced.

1182. By Mr. J. S. White.—They did pay large dividends and a bonus, but that year the traffic was very large.—Yes.

1183. Why has it been reduced?—In the Exhibition year I think their receipts were £50,000, and that was with only two-thirds of the lines open; last year, with the whole of the lines open, they had only £33,000.

1184. Is that through less population or less people travelling?—Less people travelling. That leaves a very small margin. People anticipated in the first instance they would go up to £300,000.

1185. By the Hon. E. Murgatroyd.—Did the bonus come out of the profits of the working of the line?—Yes.

1186. It was not out of the profits of water the stock?—I know nothing about that; they did water the stock by means of the houses.

1187. You are not afraid the concern will fall into the hands of the municipalities?—Not if they go on at present, because I think they are on the rising grade, but if you take one of their principal sources of revenue I do not know what will happen.

1188. Do you not think the railway lines would create traffic from the further north, and that traffic would add to your receipts in the centre, by people travelling to different places?—I do not think people would get off at a train to get on to a tram.

1189. Is not the custom now for people coming from the southern districts when they get to Finsbury-street to jump on a tram and go to different places?—Yes, a good many do.

1190. Then if the line is made there, will it not be a profit to the trams?—No. I do not think you would give us as many people as you would take away by the direct traffic. The railway officials anticipate that a great portion of their traffic will be taken from the trams. Last year the profits of the company were only £25,000; that is a very small margin, and if you reduce that to any great extent, there would not be much left.

1191. By Mr. Burton.—Have the Trust any voice in the management of the Tramway Company?—None at all.

1192. As to the capital, have you any voice in saying whether those 2,000,000 shares should exist actually instead of on paper?—No. We have nothing to do with that. The nominal capital was increased very largely during the boom. They took power to get £2,000,000; that was not the original capital.

1193. Nine hundred and sixty thousand shares are in existence on which 2s. a share has been paid up. Is there any power in the Trust to see that the other 16s. is paid up?—No. I do not know what power we should have in case of the failure of the company to carry out their engagements. We could see what was happening. We are their trustees and we should have the same power as other trustees.

1194. What do you calculate the value of the concern as a going concern?—We have no means of calculating it at all.

1195. Have you any authority to inspect into their affairs?—No.

1196. If they fulfil their obligation of paying such per cent. per annum that is all you have to do with them?—That is all.

1197. Have you any control in keeping the lines from being staked?—Yes; the Trust can call upon the company to maintain the lines in an efficient state of repair. It is an absolute power, subject to an appeal to the Supreme Court. The company can appeal to the Supreme Court against any order of the Trust ordering them to do any repairs to the lines.

1198. Have you any power who inspects the lines on behalf of the Trust?—Yes, I am the officer. I am a member of the Institution of Civil Engineers in England. I regularly inspect the lines.

1199. Do you inspect the cables?—The cables are renewed periodically. Some of them last a few weeks only, and others last a long time.

1200. Have you satisfied yourself that the concern as a going concern, is kept quite up to date?—Yes, I think it is splendidly preserved.

1201. There was no fear of the Trust having a warrant on concern handed over?—No, because we can insist upon its being kept in good order.

1202. Does not the 16s. municipal capital, added in the power you have already, put you in a good position?—Yes, but the position taken by the Trust is that it does not wish to succeed to a concern that is not paying its way. That would mean a rate on the municipalities to keep it up.

1203. On what data have you formed the opinion that the concern would not be a profligate one if those lines were constructed?—The margin of profit last year was a very small one, and if you take away any of our receipts we would almost have to work at a loss.

1204. What lines would be affected by these lines?—Nicholson-street, Brunswick-street, Johnston-street, Gt. George-street, Victoria-parade, and part of Wellington-parade, Richmond.
1205. You cannot say whether these lines are profitable?—They must have been profitable lines
I know there is a profit on the whole system, and those are the best lines.

1206. Do you know that yourself—only from hearsay: I have no personal knowledge.

1207. By the Chairman.—Supposing the line was constructed at Holdenhurst-street, would that interfere with
the tram traffic in Nicholson-street?—I suppose not.

1208. Suppose it was constructed at Young-street, would that interfere with Nicholson-street?—
I believe it would.

1209. You think they would come down from Nicholson-street?—Yes, if you carried them for 1½d.
as against 3d. they would.

1210. By the Hon. E. H. Morry.—If the concern did not pay, the company could make calls?—Yes.
If the company fail to carry out their engagements they forfeit their lease. The lease falls in to the Trust
on behalf of the municipalities.

1211. Have you no power to make them make calls to carry on their engagements?—I do not
know. The Act provides if they do not carry out their engagements the lease is forfeited. I do not know
what power there is to call up the capital.

1212. Then the uncollected capital is no good!—I do not think the Trust went in any way upon
the capital in leasing the lines to the company. Another thing is you do not expect to have to call up capital
for a running concern. The Trust only view the matter as trustees for the municipalities of the property,
and they do not wish to see the property damaged.

1213. By the Hon. E. Morry.—Are you quite sure that the Tramway Company ceased to pay
dividends?—Yes.

1214. Mr. Carpenter, on the 5th June, 1895, in his evidence before the Railway Inquiry Board—
"I suppose it goes without saying that you have been able to balance both sides of the ledger?—Yes, and
we have never missed a dividend. Our dividends have been less; we paid last year 5½ per cent., and for the
first six months of this year 2½ per cent., and we expect to pay at the end of the year another dividend of
2½ per cent., and pay all your obligations and find interest and everything else!—Yes?—I did not know
that, I though they had missed a dividend one year at least.

1215. Then it is a handsome concern all through?—It is paying 5½ per cent. at present.

1216. By Mr. Green.—With regard to the maintenance or life of the permanent way of the tram-
way: have you any idea how long the permanent way is likely to last?—No, that is a very much debatable
point. We have no evidence on that. Most of the rails in the flat parts are heavily worn at all parts, and
they have had to renew a great number of the blocks, but this year that they are putting on is likely to
make them last much longer.

1217. Yet there is no probability of the company having to meet a very heavy renewal account
at some time?—They will certainly have to renew all the blocks. There is twenty years to run yet, and
if once a rail gets broken there will not be much life in it.

1218. There might be a sudden heavy call upon the company at any time for reconstruction?—Yes,
that is one of the difficulties. We have not been able to get any data as to how long the material will
last.

1219. Have you any idea of the cost of building on trams on a system of that sort compared
with the building on a railway?—No.

1220. By Mr. Harris.—If the construction of either or both of these projected lines seriously
depressed the revenue of the Tramway Company, would the shareholders be found by-and-by to pay up
the calls to make up the deficiency?—I do not know.

1221. By Mr. J. S. White.—Is there not some period within the 30 years when the fares are to be
adjusted?—Yes, by Act of Parliament they can be adjusted after December, 1897.

1222. Is it provided that there must be no interest and seeking full before the municipalities can
make any reduction?—No, the date is fixed at 1897.

1223. Have not the excise to be calculated at that time to see if it is paying its way?—No; it
is left to the discretion of Parliament.

1224. Parliament may reduce the fare to one-half?—Yes, or to nothing at all, or raise it to double.

1225. If it paid well, the inference is that Parliament would reduce the fares?—I suppose so.

1226. If it is not paying, I suppose Parliament would not interfere?—I suppose not.

The witness withdrew.

Additional evidence on Thursday next, at eleven o'clock.

Tuesday, 20th October, 1896.
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Mr. Burton

Mr. Cavenagh

Mr. Harris
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James Harrow, sworn and examined.

1227. By the Chairman.—What are you?—President of the milk of Preston. I am a public
schoolman in Williamson-street, and milk in Preston. I am a native of that place.

1228. You already have a line from Preston to Melbourne?—Yes, but it is not a line that suits the
convenience of the district or trade to its advancement.

1229. Do you travel by all?—Yes.

1230. You go round by Royal Park?—Yes: that is the only way you can go by rail.

1231. You could get out at North Fitzroy or North Carlton?—Is the event of wanting to go to
Smith-street or Brunswick-street we get out at Northcote and take the tram.

1232. What part of Preston do you live in?—Near the Murray-reservoir station.

1233. How long does it take you to go to Spencer-street from there?—About half-an-hour.
1254. Is that an inconvenient line to take to come in to business?—Sometimes we find it rather hot; a number of the residents complain of the heat of the time. It often prevents people going out there to live. I know of numbers of people living in the district and going into business have had to move from the district.

1255. Which carries the most into town, the railway or the tram?—We have no tram to Preston; the joculask is a mile and a half from the centre of Preston. It does not travel very often by the tram.

1256. Do you think any more would go by rail if there were a direct line?—Undoubtedly. Smith-street and Brunswick-street are the business centres for most of the people out in that district, and have been for years. A number of them drive, and a number take the tram. I feel convinced if direct communication was given a great many more would travel by the train.

1257. What line do you favour?—The direct line. The municipalities of Northcote, Preston, Lynd, Whittlesea, and Heidelberg waited on the late Sir James Paterson in reference to direct railway communications, and there seemed to be a division among them. They were told to return and settle it among themselves. At the conference held in Northcote, the northern suburbs were unanimously in favour of a direct line.

1258. You call the direct line the line from Fitzroy present station to Youngs-road?—The Fitzroy line would be the direct line.

1259. Have you any idea whether that line would pay?—I think so. It would suit the convenience of the district, and enable a number to settle in the district who have been retarded for the want of communication.

1260. We wonder if there is reasonable ground to suppose that it would pay. If the residents there cannot form an idea, who should?—I think, from the numerous different conferences and hearings the statements of residents, if they had a direct line it would pay.

1261. You cannot exactly tell the basis on which you form that opinion?—From the number of people to my knowledge who have had to leave the district, and the number who would be likely to settle down in the district, providing reasonable communication by rail were given, I believe it would tend to increase the population considerably.

1262. What is the occupation of the people residing in that district?—As far as Preston is concerned, most of them are in business or at work in the city.

1263. They want to come in every morning and go back every evening?—Yes.

1264. By the Hon. D. McCulloch,—What is there unreasonable about the present line?—It takes to 44 minutes to come in from Preston by rail. You can drive in in half an hour; it is only 12 miles to Murray-road, whereas by rail it is 9 or 10.

1265. By the direct line what would you do it in?—Twenty to 25 minutes.

1266. It would shorten the time by half?—Yes. The ordinary train takes 10 minutes to Murray-road and the Whittlesea train takes 24 minutes. There is a slight delay at North Fitzroy. North Fitzroy is 5 miles from the Post Office; Flemington-bridge is 8 miles from the Post Office. We travel round there making no very hard way. We lose from ten minutes to a quarter of an hour between these stations without making any distance.

1267. The State drags you round that circle; does that pay?—I should not think so.

1268. You would prefer to run the risk of coming in in twenty minutes. Is the area of building wide enough to sustain that line?—Quite.

1269. What is the area?—I think about 14 square miles in Preston alone.

1270. Northcote has a large area also?—Yes; I do not know the area.

1271. There is no limit about the capacity of the district to support a railway if you get near enough?—I do not think so. The number of people who travel at present would improve the returns considerably. A number drive now.

1272. You hear complaints, as a president, against the system?—Endless complaints.

1273. Is it a bar to the development of the place?—Yes. We feel it so and have felt it so for a considerable time.

1274. Is this the cheapest line to make as an experiment?—I think so. The price of land is very low at present; material is low and labour is available.

1275. If it is to be made, your opinion, as president, is that it should be made now?—Yes, I think so; it would be advantageous to make it at present.

1276. By the Hon. E. Morey.—How long does it take you to come in by tram from Preston?—I very seldom travel by the tram, but I should think it is 25 minutes to Clifton Hill, and about a quarter of an hour to South Preston. Preston proper has no tram.

1277. What do you pay by the tram?—Fivemprise, I think; that is 10d. for the return trip.

1278. Are you in favour of in Preston?—The direct line—that is, the Fitzroy line. The Collingwood line would be another circle. We go round Royal Park with one line; Collingwood would bring us round the other way.

1279. What is the difference in the distance between Collingwood and Fitzroy?—I do not remember the measurements of the Collingwood line. The present line round Flemington-street is about 93 miles.

1280. Either of those two lines would suit you?—No. Brunswick-street and Smith-street are the business centres for the residents of Preston, and have been for years. People come to Smith-street or Brunswick-street to shop. The Collingwood line would leave them about a mile and a half away, and they would have to take the tram to get to the shops.

1281. By Mr. Harris.—Did those people leave the district for want of direct railway communication, or was there any other reason?—It was in consequence of the time that it took to get in and out of town; they could not afford the time.

1282. How many persons or families left in that way?—To my own knowledge, perhaps five or six.

1283. What were they doing?—One was a printer; one was our own stationer; the others were occupied in town.

1284. Had any of them lived in the place?—No; they were residents, but probably they would become landowners.

1285. Have you any complaints of land left the district through a want of direct communication?—Not that I know of. I cannot bring to mind any just now.

The session withdrawn.
1296. *By the Chairman.*—What are you?—A provision merchant and brass-furner, residing in Preston at the southern end, just on the boundary of Northcote. I have been there 33 years; 43 years in the colony.

1297. Do you want a direct railway communication with Melbourne?—Yes, the district wants it.

1298. Would you yourself avail yourself of it if you had it?—Yes, most certainly I would.

1299. Are you sending much of your stuff to Melbourne by rail?—No, I send it by my own cart.

1300. If you had direct railway communication would you send it by rail?—Not unless it was going away direct to the country. The loading and unloading would be as expensive as the carting when you have to keep the horses, any way.

1301. It would not be of great benefit to you?—In some ways it would; anything going away to the country direct would go straight from the factory.

1302. Do you get any live stock by railway?—Yes; I get it now to Bellstreet. I could not get it any nearer than I get it now. It may take a little longer on the journey, but live stock is not delayed much on the journey; it generally comes direct through.

1303. Has the Preston line been of any use to the district?—Very little, because there is such a circle to go round, and it takes such a long time to travel that circle. You can go as quickly with a cart, and get back sooner, because the trains run once an hour and you must stay that hour, otherwise you cannot come back, and if you do chance to miss a train you cannot get one for another hour.

1304. Would it pay the trains to run more often than that if it were a direct line?—Yes, I think so. The quicker the traffic the more it brings population.

1305. Have you any idea of the population beyond Northcote to the reservoir that would go by the direct route?—There is a good population for a country district, good building land, and we consider that that building will result in a healthy demand for the want of quick communication.

1306. What is the population of Preston shire?—I cannot tell from memory.

1307. Which line do you prefer?—The Fitzroy line.

1308. Would you rather have the Collingwood line than the one you have now, if you cannot get Fitzroy?—I think if we do not have a direct line we might as well have the one outer circle as the other.

1309. Would it be any nearer?—It might be a little nearer. Besides, the Preston people consider they would not have the same facilities by that line for getting passengers. We look upon the Fitzroy line as the most likely line to pay.

1310. You do not agree with the estimate of population given by the Railway Department?—Not to appearance.

1311. Are you in a position to contradict it?—I would not like to do that, because I have not gone into the figures myself, but by going through the district you would certainly come to a conclusion in your own mind as to what the thickest population was.

1312. Has there been any dissatisfaction in your district since the railway opened at having to go round by Royal Park?—Yes, not long before. There has been an agitation for over 30 years in our district to my knowledge. At that time we expected to get a railway along Nicholson-street.

1313. At the time it was mooted that a railway should be made round by Royal Park did you protest against its being carried that way?—No. When we found it was going through Royal Park we considered it a way of communication to get to town, but we did not consider that it was an all-time railway, because it was made as an outer circle to bring the Gippsland traffic round to Specker-street.

1314. *By the Hon. B. Mitchell.*—You are in a position to speak positively as to the general complaints for the last three or four years about this long journey?—The complaints have been unanimous about it.

1315. At every election it has cropped up?—Yes; the question "What are you going to do about the railway?" is put to every candidate for either House.

1316. You think, having been mixed up largely with the trade of the place, that it is better to come through Fitzroy because of the trade at Fitzroy itself?—Yes. We Preston people think it will be a better gathering ground for the railway than through Collingwood.

1317. Have you any misgivings about the line paying? You know Mr. Fitzpatrick said he could reach Grey-street from the heart of Fitzroy in seven minutes; is there any doubt if that is done the State will lose nothing?—I do not think so.

1318. The people coming down from your district to trade in Fitzroy would be very numerous?—I am sure of it.

1319. Have you heard of the likelihood of the trains coming into the possession of the people before the time?—I have heard nothing of that.

1320. You have not heard of the people being afraid of what would happen twenty years hence?—I have seen it in the press.

1321. Are you afraid of it?—No. I am not at all afraid of that; my impression is that the trains were put there as a speculation, and I do not see why a speculation in one part of the district should retard another part.

1322. Have you any idea that any one would be injured?—No.

1323. Do you think the trains will be injured by this direct railway?—No. I think the direct railway will ring a larger population, and it will increase the traffic both, so both will be benefited.

1324. Would you like to think the State was committed to make people travel for all time round this big circle to benefit the trains?—No.

1325. If you owned the railway would you not consider whether you would not try this short track rather than carry that heavy rolling-stock round that big circle?—I think if I were going into that business I would try to take it through the most thickly populated part I could.

1326. And the shortest?—Yes.

1327. Do we understand that you will ever be contented to reside in Preston and transact business if it is understood finally that we have abandoned the short route?—The effect will be that we will be shut out from the centre of population, and we will have to get out and in the best way we can, the same as we had to do 30 years ago.
1298. That will damage your prospects?—Yes; the prospects of the districts and the State itself.

1299. By Mr. J. S. White. You expected a railway at Nicholson-street on the old tram track?

—Yes.

1300. When the Crown was selling the land and there did you object that that land should be reserved with a view of carrying out the railway?—No; we offered to make a tram road to Yan Yean along the tram track if the Government would allow us to do so as a private company, but they would not allow us.

1301. Thirty years ago a lot of the land along Nicholson-street was not sold—why did you not object to the Crown selling that land at the time?—Because the Government did not seem inclined to make us a railway, and they would not allow us to make one, therefore we considered we were shot out altogether.

1302. You stop until the place is thoroughly built on and then ask the Crown to buy expensive land to make a line?—The same as they have done in other districts.

1303. Where?—All round Prahran and that way.

1304. When did the Crown make a railway to Prahran?—Not many years ago.

1305. The Prahran line was connected by a private company; the Crown had nothing to do with it?—No; but they bought it afterwards.

1306. That was their own doing?—Yes, because they would not allow a company to make a line; the Government took it into their own hands. The Government purchased that line privately.

1307. Was not that paying well at the time?—It was supposed to be, but the rolling-stock was run out pretty well I believe.

1308. Has it not paid well since?—It did not at the start.

1309. Has it ever made a loss?—Those railways did not pay at the start. I believe the North-Eastern line was the only one that paid from the start.

1310. Ever since the Government has taken over the southern line has it lost paid?—It was well established before the Government took it over.

1311. Then, they had a good bargain?—No, I think not. The rolling-stock was run out, and they had to replace the rolling-stock.

1312. The rolling-stock has been charged to the line since; the interest has been paid on the rolling-stock as well as the other works; is that not an inference that it has paid?—That was not at the time. I do not consider it was a good bargain at the time from a commercial point of view, because the rolling-stock that was considered good had to be replaced.

1313. If you bought a business and had to buy new plant in connection with it, and that business paid you interest, and also a sinking fund for the plant you put in, would that not be a fair bargain?—Yes, provided you got an increase in population—you cannot do it without the population.

1314. I am speaking now of the southern lines. You say if the population was there it would pay. Have you ever heard or read that any change has been made to the State for any rolling-stock put on the southern lines; that the revenue has not paid for the whole of the rolling-stock invested, and working expenses?—I was told to believe that the railways have not paid. If it has paid for the rolling-stock and everything it must have paid.

1315. You said your company would have constructed a line to the Yan Yean from Melbourne?

—Yes.

1316. Did you apply to Parliament?—Yes, and Mr. Taylor, who was then engineer of the waterworks, objected, and the Government rejected it; they would not allow it on those conditions.

1317. Who introduced the Bill into the House to give you the right?—Mr. Manning Thomas was the leading man in the movement.

1318. Was he a Member?—No.

1319. Then it was merely an agitation in the districts?—The engineer of waterworks opposed it. He said it would be injurious to the water pipes running alongside. At the present time they are running under and over them and anywhere; but that was the objection at that time.

1320. By the Hon. E. Morey. Have you taken into consideration which would suit Heidelberg best. Is it never for Heidelberg to come through Collingwood that through Fitzroy?—I think there is very little difference. I do not think they would gain any benefit by going through Collingwood?—No, I do not think so. My impression is that the Heidelberg people were justified to come the direct route themselves.

1321. Is the direct line from Heidelberg through Collingwood?—If goes round too far towards the Yarra.

1322. They would be just as well served by a line coming through Fitzroy as by a line coming through Collingwood?—I think so.

1323. By Mr. Harris. How long have you been carrying on the bacon-selling business?—Thirty-four years.

1324. Your establishment is one of the largest in the colony?—Yes.

1325. You say that the direct Fitzroy route would be of no benefit to your establishment?—Yes, for sending anything direct to the country it would.

1326. But not for sending stuff to Melbourne?—The unloading would come to as much expense one way as the other, but if the business increased and population increased, it is quite possible it would pay to send it by railway.

1327. Are there any other factories out there?—Yes; there is a very large factory alongside me. It would affect them more than me.

1328. You complained about the few trains that were run; would it pay to run more trains as matters now stand?—Yes, because the quicker the communication the more population would come. It would induce people to live in the district and increase the population.

1329. If you got a direct route there would be a lot of building take place at Fitzroy. Are there many vacant places at Prahran at present?—Too many. It is fine building land too.

1330. Is that through the want of railway communication?—We have always considered so for many years; we are so near the centre of population.

1331. Are they not exempt now for some other cause than the want of direct communication?—Not that I am aware of.
1333. By Mr. J. S. White.—You say the houses are not empty for any other reason than the want of communication?—I say the want of communication is the means of vacating the district at the present time.

1334. If you had the business in bricks that there was some years ago, would that keep the place free?—Wooded all the houses?—No, they did, but the depression carried the houses; a lot of people left the district on that account.

1355. You said if the passengers had to go round by way of Collingwood they might as well go as they do at present?—Very nearly.

1336. If you had this direct communication population would rapidly increase?—Yes.

1337. Where would they come from?—All parts.

1338. Would they come from where there is railway communication now?—People do not like to be exposed as they go to get free fresh air, and they generally get it at Preston, although it is so close to town.

1339. Where do you expect the population is coming from to fill Preston?—We think we should try to come some means to keep the people in the country.

1340. But where is the population coming from to go to Preston?—From all parts round Melbourne.

1341. Where they have already railway communication, which you have not got?—Yes.

1342. By the Hon. D. McEwan.—Have you ever been able to satisfactorily answer the question where the people coming from?—No; we may can answer that.

1343. The people do come when they get the facilities to travel?—Certainly.

1344. Is there room for two railways, one by way of Hoddle-street and another through Fitzroy?—I do not think the State can afford both at the present time, though it has always been my opinion there is room for two railways.

1345. If it is thought that the State can afford two, would you construct the two?—Yes; but under present circumstances I do not see how the two can be constructed.

1346. By the Hon. E. McEwan.—You have carriages on the road bringing the goods in?—Yes.

1347. What do they get per ton?—They mostly express goods; any heavy goods go by rail.

1348. What is the difference between the charge by the carters and the rail?—Very little.

1349. They do not patronise the carriers more than the railways for goods?—Not heavy goods.

1350. The road is good all the way?—Yes.

1351. It is not likely they will run opposition and run the railways off, the same as in other places?—I do not think so.

1352. By Mr. Corowa.—You said the Collingwood route would not suit you, and that both lines are necessary when the country can afford it. Do you know the scheme so connect from Collingwood station south of Johnston-street, and into the Young-street line from Fitzroy?—No, I am not acquainted with it.

1353. Do you know whether that proposal goes through the most thickly populated parts of Collingwood and Fitzroy?—I could not give a decided answer to that.

1354. Do you think, off-hand, a route of that sort would suit your purposes as well as the other one?—I do not think so.

The witness withdrawn.

Dennis R. Dunn, sworn and examined.

1355. By the Chairman.—What are you?—Secretary of the town of Preston. I reside in Preston. I have been there 50 years. The district is very badly in need of a railway.

1356. Have you not one already?—No; we do not call that a railway; it is a part of a line that was originally intended to carry the heavy southern traffic, and not being completed, the portion of the line ending at the corner circle line was constructed on to Preston, but the other portion remains to be undertaken.

1357. Where do the most of the passengers who come from Preston and neighbourhood by boat leave the train?—Speaking generally, the people from Preston who have business to attend to in town daily go round by Spencer-street. People who come in to town to do their family business and domestic business generally get out at North Fitzroy and take the Nicholson-street tram or else a cab.

1358. Do many come in and out to that way?—Yes, a considerable number.

1359. Where do those families deal?—Bromswick-street and Smith-street principally; there are the centres of the domestic business done by the residents of Preston.

1360. You know the country beyond Preston up to Woodstock?—Yes.

1361. What part of the town do the farmers and dairyman there chiefly deal with?—Bromswick-street and Smith-street chiefly. Melbourne is not the centre of their business.

1362. Does much produce come down from that part by rail?—No.

1363. How do they take their milk to town?—Some milk comes by train, but I think the greater share of it comes by express wagons.

1364. What part of the metropolis do they deliver in?—Mostly in Fitzroy.

1365. If they had a train with a station in the centre of Fitzroy would they come by train instead of by wagon?—I think yes; it would be more convenient.

1366. Do you think a direct railway would pay?—I do.

1367. On what basis do you form your opinion?—On the facilities that would be given for the transaction of business, and for people of means to purchase substantial residences in desirable situations. It would enable these people to go in and out without inconveniences, and their friends to go back and forth to them in the same way. All that tends to increase population, and, therefore, adds to the income of the railway. The more direct the route the greater will be the facilities given, and the greater the probabilities of the undertaking paying. Our district has been for years and years reserved for the want of speedy and direct communication with the metropolis. That has been the opinion of most of the residents, especially the old residents.
1366. That purely supposition I think not. The fact that the southern suburbs are so densely populated now we consider is simply owing to the facilities for travelling provided for those people.

1367. Then you would rob Peter to pay Paul?—No, decidedly not, but we can offer so much healthier sites out north that we should be helping the Railway Department by constructing this railway, and would lessen expenditure very considerably in connection with another Department—the Board of Health. People going out there in very great numbers. People could find their health so much improved that the work of that Department would be considerably lessened.

1370. What do you say about the present population. Are those people in the northern area, taking Fitzroy, Collingwood, and Northcote, and the districts beyond, entitled to the expenditure that this would necessitate?—I think so. They have been paying their quota of the total loss on the railway from their inception up to the present time without having had the possibility put within their reach of enjoying any of the facilities they have had to pay for. Independently of that, the population through which the direct route that we advocate would go of itself is so large that it would feel on a payable basis a direct railway.

1371. That argument about your paying for the loss on other lines would infer that you do not expect this would pay?—No; we think it would pay on other grounds, but that was one reason why we should have the want supplied as early as possible.

1372. What is the population of your shire?—Between 3,000 and 3,500.

1373. Are they producers or consumers?—They are consumers and producers both.

1374. Have you any idea what percentage they require in the shape of taxes?—I could not give that information. I would require to know the food consumption of each particular family to answer that.

1375. Have you not got any idea how much each person would consume in the average?—The consumption of different families depends largely upon their incomes. If we could get a population of more means we should have a very large consumption then.

1376. By the Hon. D. McErlie—You would insist the Fitzroy railway to pay?—Yes.

1377. The entire length of this railway is only 492 miles?—Yes.

1378. Suppose one line is constructed is it your opinion that ultimately they will have to construct the other?—I think so. I think the development in the north-east and the space between the north and north-east will necessitate the construction of the Collingwood line later on.

1379. You do not wish the Committee to understand that if they construct one line the question is finally settled?—Certainly not.

1380. This spur or cross railway from one to the other would be an expense incurred merely for a temporary use?—It would serve exactly the same purpose as the outstanding Outer Circle has served for so many years, the construction of the Whiteman line—just a temporary arrangement.

1381. If it is necessary to construct the two, is there the best time to do the two?—There is no time like the present.

1382. You have heard that the trains are frightened about this?—Unnecessarily so. The increase of population will bring an increase of business, and neither the trains nor the railways will be able to carry all the traffic. Both means of communication will ultimately be required by the population.

1383. Is it a wise thing for Parliament to permit this dragging of the rolling stock twenty minutes extra round by Royal Park, when they could take it in seven minutes to the heart of Fitzroy?—I think it is an unwise thing. I think the construction of the direct line would, by the more expense saved in the shorter distance, in the course of a reasonable number of years pay for itself.

1384. Do you think the people of that district will ever be contented to live there, and will not torrent Parliament until they get a direct line?—I am sure they never will, because it is practically putting them into a position more remote than if they were at Lyden in point of distance.

1385. If you had had this direct railway at the time you wanted it from Elwood-street, which means that, according to Mr. Fitzpatrick's estimate, not arrive at Geelong in three minutes, what would have been the condition of your district now?—Instead of Preston being a small village, and Northcote being a small town, both of them would be cities.

1386. You think we should construct both these railways because they will develop trade enough to pay both trains and railways?—Decisively so.

1387. By the Hon. E. Morey.—How much land have you in cultivation in your shire?—I cannot give the area, though we provide the Government with statistics every year. Most of the East riding is under cultivation.

1388. If this railway were made would it be the cause of settling more people on the land there?—I think so.

1389. What do you produce?—I would not rely upon the products of the land for the increase of the population, at present the farmers grow hay mostly. I do not think we ever need look to any great increase in the cultivation in Preston.

1390. How are you going to get the population?—By the increase in residential site holders.

1391. Where are you going to get them from?—All points of the compass, from localities that possess inferior advantages.

1392. You want to rob one portion of the suburbs of Melbourne to feed yours?—We would not propose to rob any, but we would relieve the congestion of some of the southern suburbs.

1393. By Mr. J. S. White—Collingwood is thickly built upon now?—Yes, but I think we should find a good many of the moneyed men become our residents.

1394. By the Hon. E. Morey.—You know the districts round the suburbs of Melbourne?—Yes.

1395. Are there not plenty of buildings at present for the population?—No, not nearly sufficient. We have had too much building of the "derry" or "run-down" order, and you cannot get a decent house in Preston. If a man puts up a decent house there are two or three people running after it at once.

1396. The population has not increased lately?—No, but it has held its own, and that is saying a good deal, considering the depression.

1397. You think the State should make a line to move the people from the east or somewhere else to your district, and that would be an advantage to the State?—No, but I would give the people there a line which they are entitled to, and leave these people to judge themselves whether they shifted their quarters or not.
1398. But you think the people would come there and build fresh houses?—Yes. There are lots of people in all the southern suburbs who have land there now, and who are only waiting for reasonable facilities to build.

1399. Is not the population of the city suffering from over-building now?—Yes, decidedly.

1400. Why do you want a railway to add more to the people of the city?—It would not have the effect of adding to that. It would fill up the vacant houses. It would give an impetus to business, and development of any kind must necessarily lead to an increase of population.

1401. How can that be, unless you are producing something that will be a benefit to mankind?—The production upon which the city depends comes from the interior; it is the manipulation and manufacture of those products that give employment to the masses in the city of Melbourne. They must go out to the country to find residences, and as the productivity of the country increases, and increased quantities are delivered in the city, the number of hands to deal with them must be increased, and requirements will arise for residential sites in the suburbs.

1402. How many thousand houses are empty at present round about the suburbs?—I cannot say anything about the southern suburbs.

1403. Taking all round Melbourne?—I can only speak from learnings, even as to Brunswick, Fitzroy, or Collingwood. I saw in passing through those suburbs a great many empty houses.

1404. What is the difference in the rates during the last year?—Rents are rising now, if anything.

1405. Are you aware that rents have come down more than one-half?—Yes, more than that. I know in Preston you can get some of the "run-downs" for 1s. a week. A few years ago you would pay 7s. 6d. a week for the same. A good six-roomed house in Preston is always sought for, and it brings a rent of 10s. a week.

1406. Have you any industries in your shire?—Yes, there are several industries that are very flourishing upon the development of which during several years the shire has almost entirely depended, namely, the manufacturing industry and the harness and bacon curing industries.

1407. What are the inhabitants principally engaged in?—In tanning, harness and bacon curing, brick making, soap making, wood washing, and various employments in the city, besides farming, gardening, and so on.

1408. You still think there is plenty of room for as many more?—I do.

1409. Engaged in those lines?—Yes.

1410. By Mr. J. S. White.—Are you valuer for the shire?—No.

1411. Did your valuation last year?—Not last year. They have just completed the valuation for the current year.

1412. Can you tell us the annual valuation in 1894 as against 1896?—It was about 50 per cent. higher in 1891 than in 1896. The valuation just completed is about 12 per cent. lower than the valuation of two years ago.

1413. Then rents are not increasing?—Our valuation does not so much depend upon the house valuation as upon the value of vacant allotments of land. Our houses are not so numerous.

1414. Does the value of the capital or the annual value?—He chooses whichever principle would be most advantageous to the shire.

1415. It is not less than 5 per cent. on the capital value?—No.

1416. Is the capital value of land in Preston easily arrived at?—No, it is very difficult to give land values.

1417. If you have the railway you think you will be able to put a large valuation on by building houses there, and taking population from Collingwood and South Melbourne and other places?—A demand would arise for land, and it would become more valuable.

1418. By Mr. Craven.—Seeing it would make the great improvement in Preston that you say, if it were constructed, and did not pay, would too people there be prepared to meet some of the loss?—I do not think it would be a fair proposition to make unless a similar proposal were made applicable to all the people who are benefited by existing lines of railway.

1419. Suppose it were made to apply to all country lines in future?—As long as the principle is made general, I have no doubt there would be no objection on the part of the people there to fall in with it.

The witness withdrawn.

William H. Waddell, sworn and examined.

1420. By the Chairman.—What are you?—An accountant, residing in Fairfield. I am a councillor of the shire of Heidelberg. I have lived at Fairfield about ten years.—[The witness reads the following paper:—]

Revision passed by the Heidelberg Shire Council on 10th September, 1896.—"That this council is in favour of leaving the selection of the route for the direct connexion with Melbourne entirely in the hands of the Railways Standing Committee."

Evidence in Favour of Line.

| Cost of present line, Collingwood to Heidelberg, 24 miles, averaging £35,291 per mile (Railway Report, page 29) | £188,054.7.1 |
| Revenue (page 57) | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | £5,053.9.2 |
| Working expenses (page 57) | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 0.062 |
| Loss on working (page 57) | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 0.0 |
| Interest on capital at 4 per cent. (page 57) | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 7.536 |
| Total cost | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 30,831.5.4 |
| Total train miles run for year (page 57) | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 61,689.5.4 |
| Revenue per train mile (page 57) | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1.75 |
| Working expenses (page 57) | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 2.5 |

In the above statement the annual loss on the service from Spencer-street to Collingwood is not included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Travel</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Price per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily ticket</td>
<td>8 daily</td>
<td>£0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st return, Heidelberg to Collingwood</td>
<td>7 daily</td>
<td>£0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd return, Heidelberg to Collingwood</td>
<td>7 daily</td>
<td>£0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly, 1st class, Heidelberg to Collingwood</td>
<td>2 classes</td>
<td>£1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly, 2nd class, Heidelberg to Collingwood</td>
<td>2 classes</td>
<td>£1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with Northcote—
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Travel</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Price per Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily, 1st class, Heidelberg to Northcote</td>
<td>2 classes</td>
<td>£0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly, 1st class, Heidelberg to Northcote</td>
<td>2 classes</td>
<td>£1.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This time in train and in money we are hours beyond all reason, and because of this many persons who had been attracted by the natural beauty of our district, and had come to reside amongst us, after a little time have been forced to leave the place and seek homes where the disadvantages complained of are non-existent. And until such time as direct communication with Melbourne is improved, we cannot hope for any material increase in the population. In speaking of population, it has been asserted as an argument against the construction of the line that the population settled in both Collingwood and Northcote is already so dense that there is little room for any increase. The mere fact of the existence of such a population is, to my mind, one of the strongest arguments in favour of the line, because, as it does, ensuring capabilities right from the start, which so other line had the advantage of when first projected. Assuming however, that there is little scope for increase of population in these municipalities, the possibilities of our line alone are simply illusory. When Mr. Metcalf was preparing the metropolitan sewage scheme, Mr. Hayler, desirous of seeing that direct railway communication was only a matter of time, estimated that in 50 years (1890) the population of the shire of Northcote was 4,000, which would be 10,000 by 1940. Surely such a provision for expansion ought to satisfy the most exacting. It may here also be stated that from the district adjacent to the metropolitan area of our city alone one-third of the population uses the present line—farmers and orchardists, who comprise the bulk of the residents, preferring to drive straight in town rather than travel by the present circuitous roads. The population represented by these districts is—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population by District ($)1985</th>
<th>$100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenrowan riding, city of Heidelberg</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangaroo Grounds</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eltham township</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templestowe</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1422. Has the opening of that railway improved that district?—Definitely it has.

1423. What do you think has been the effect of opening the line in Flinder-street—The opening of the line in Flinder-street has increased the importance of the district—I am positive of it. Many people have said to me—"If you give us a direct line to Heidelberg we will come out and live there, but we cannot afford the expense and loss of time involved now." I would not have gone there but for medical advice that I must get away from the seaside for the benefit of my wife's health.

1424. Are the buildings in Fairfield increasing?—Our population has increased enormously since the line was built. The houses are nearly all let, and the takings of the Fairfield station are increasing every month, with all the advantages, because the line is healthy.

1425. Are they increasing at Alphington?—I have no inquiries at Alphington. I think Fairfield is benefiting more than the other. It's only 4 miles from the city.

1426. Is the revenue at Alphington increasing?—I could not say.

1427. Are the buildings about Heidelberg increasing?—It is impossible to get good buildings out there to rent. Many people I know have been trying to get houses, and they have been unable to do so. One gentleman I know is paying £75 a year for a house.

1428. Are there any empty houses?—Not that I know of in Heidelberg. There may be, perhaps, two or three in Fairfield.

1429. Is the land changing hands there?—No. I know a gentleman who wanted to buy a piece of land in the borough, and the holder wanted the same price as the land was bringing in the boom time. He would not part with it for less.

1430. Would he sell it if the railway was continued into Flinder-street?—The value of the property would be largely raised, but it might not be so high as in the boom time.

1431. What would the high prices they ask prevent people going out there to live?—No, I do not think so, because they can buy land there now cheaper than in the southern suburbs.

1432. You have no idea how much of the goods traffic would go by rail?—I do not think there would be much goods traffic; it would be a passenger line.

1433. How do you get your goods there?—They come by carts from the various establishments in Collingwood and Fitzroy.

1434. Do they go all the way to Heidelberg?—Yes.

1435. If they had stations at Fitzroy and Collingwood would the goods still go by vehicles?—Yes, just as you see Foy and Gibson's van going out to South Yarra, Prahran, and Brighton.

1436. By the Hon. D. McIlveen.—You have gone into the matter minutely. You mean that paper mainly as an answer to those men who write detracting from these proposals?—Some parts of it only.

1437. How long have we been using this horsebox by the Royal Park?—Yes.

1438. What slack was the load on Flinder-street, Spencer-street, North Melbourne, Middle-road, Richmond-bridge, Royal Park, North Carlton, Fitzroy, Clifton Hill, Collingwood; back again to Clifton Hill, then South feminine, Fairfield, Alphington, Fronton, and Heidelberg—sixteen stations altogether.

1439. Who invented that line?—The line was originally intended to join the Richmond line, and it was passed by Parliament in 1880, but was stopped at Collingwood, and a portion of the line from Collingwood went there then utilized.

1440. Have you analyzed what the State loss?—Yes; £5,184 on the line from Collingwood to Heidelberg. That does not include the loss on the line from Spencer-street to Collingwood.