

Summing up the whole position, I have no hesitation in stating, as my opinion, that the reclamation proposed by the Corporation would prejudicially affect the Harbour of Wellington and its navigation, the amount of injury done being in direct proportion to the trade of the port. Although in a less degree, the modified proposal of the Marine Department, made as a compromise, is open to the same objection as the Corporation's plan; and, furthermore, the breastwork is not in the best direction for forming a wharf. The line first laid down by the Marine Department is undoubtedly the extreme limit to which reclamation should be made, and I think it would even be advisable to keep a little inside this near the line of Cuba and Taranaki Streets, the outer boundary of the reclamation being kept in about 8 feet at low water.

Although there may be no direct return from it, a few acres of water in such a place as that under discussion is far more valuable than the same area of land adjoining. Good harbours in convenient localities in New Zealand are by no means plentiful, and the good places in them are still fewer. The prosperity of the colony depends as much on its harbours as on any other natural endowment; it is therefore of the utmost importance that nothing should be done that is calculated, even in the most remote degree, to injure them.

The Hon. the Minister, Marine Department.

I have, &c.,

W. N. BLAIR.

#### Enclosure 4 in No. 25.

MEMORANDUM for the Hon. the MINISTER, Marine Department.

THESE reports from Messrs. Bell, Higginson, and Blair, engineers, confirm my already expressed opinion as to the effect of the proposed Te Aro reclamation on the Harbour of Wellington and its navigation. They would lead me also to beg to be allowed to modify the terms of my memorandum of 14th March, 1882, in which I expressed an opinion that the line, as modified by me on plan sent to Wellington Harbour Board, might be adopted. This modification was intended to meet a corresponding concession on the part of the City Council, which body, however, has made no concession, but adheres to its first-proposed line. Also, it will be observed that in one of the reports under notice an opinion is expressed that the face of any reclamation should be limited to 8 feet low water springs, and in another that the limit should be 6 feet. In making my first report on this matter, I felt I was making as large a concession as possible in fixing 9 to 10 feet as the limit, feeling that 8 feet would be more to the interests of the harbour. This feeling is strengthened after hearing the Harbourmaster's views, and on reading the opinions of other engineers, and I am convinced that it would be well to limit the reclamation to this depth.

This, of course, refers to that part of the reclamation to the south-east of the Queen's Wharf, and will not apply to that portion leading from thence to the Queen's Wharf, along which line the water is shallower, but might be deepened by dredging. The above view would be strengthened by the probability that the requirements of the port will in future, as suggested in one of the reports, necessitate dredging over this area, and thus obtain better berthage and convenience for vessels of moderate size. In reference to the suggestion of Messrs. Bell and Higginson that shelter might be found at the eastern side of the harbour, towards the baths, for small craft and boats, &c., I have to remark that this part of the harbour, being notoriously the most exposed, would not be suited to such a purpose.

The question of stairs and slip for watermen's boats, also suggested in these reports, should not be lost sight of in any plans of reclamation, and should form part of the scheme. Details like these should be closely looked after by the Harbour Board, as conservators of *all* interests connected with the harbour.

If approved, I will submit plan of amended line, with recommendation.

JOHN BLACKETT,

Marine Engineer.

4th April, 1882.

#### No. 26.

THE SECRETARY, Marine Department, to the TOWN CLERK, Wellington.

SIR,—

Marine Department, Wellington, 12th April, 1882.

I have been directed by the Minister having charge of this department to transmit to you the accompanying copies of the reports made at his request by Messrs. C. Napier Bell, H. P. Higginson, and W. N. Blair, on the proposed Te Aro reclamation, to which he referred in his interview with the deputation from the City Council on Thursday last, together with a further memorandum on the same subject by Mr. Blackett, Marine Engineer; and I am to request you to be good enough to submit the same to the City Council. [Enclosure same as in No. 25.]

I have, &c.,

WILLIAM SEED,  
Secretary.

The Town Clerk, Wellington.

#### No. 27.

MEMORANDUM from the NAUTICAL ADVISER, Marine Department, to the Hon. the MINISTER for the Department.

THE part of the harbour proposed to be reclaimed, as shown on plan M.D. 589, is only used at present by small craft, such as pleasure-boats, &c., and, if this anchorage for these vessels is to be preserved, the reclamation should not be so great as proposed either by the Colonial Marine Engineer or the City Council, whose lines are not materially different, the difference between them being only 165 feet at the broadest part of the proposed work on cross section U, V. I am, however, of opinion