

SESS. II.—1884.
NEW ZEALAND.

THE KUMARA SLUDGE-CHANNEL.

(PETITION OF MR. A. MILLER AND OTHERS, AND REPORT THEREON BY MR. H. A. GORDON.)

Laid on the Table by the Hon. Mr. Stout, with leave of the House.

PETITION of ALEXANDER MILLER, on behalf of 61 Miners using the Sludge-channel at Kumara, addressed to the Chairman and Members of the Gold Fields Committee, protesting against Priority of Rights to use the Sludge-channel being allowed, and requesting that Increased Accommodation be provided for the Miners; and Memorandum by the Inspecting Engineer on same.

PETITION.
Sludge-channel Question.

GENTLEMEN,—

Kumara, 6th October, 1884.

As we advised by telegram to-day, we beg to supply you with information as to the position of the various parties working into the sludge-channel, with the object of assisting the Gold Fields Committee towards the satisfactory settlement of the sludge-channel question.

As may have appeared to you, the main difficulty is the question of priority of right to the use of the sludge-channel. We are under the impression that a certain number of claimholders using the sludge-channel, whose original permits have expired, have petitioned Government with the view of establishing a priority of right to the use of the sludge-channel. Should we be correct in our supposition, we beg to protest against such a right being granted, as being an injustice to others using the sludge-channel. We consider that any such claim cannot be sustained, either morally or legally, for many reasons. The question of priority of right to the use of the sludge-channel was tried in the Warden's Court here, on the 11th July last, and Warden Giles's decision was that those only whose original permits had not expired could claim priority, and that only for the term for which their permits are dated. It will thus be obvious that those claimholders whose original permits have expired, and who are now, we suppose, trying to substantiate a claim of fixed priority, have no legal right. Besides, they have been working for many months under new permits, in which priority is not recognized. Warden Giles's ruling places nineteen out of thirty parties using the sludge-channel on an equal footing; the remaining eleven parties hold original permits, which are still in force, and they have the power of exercising their priority of right. This right entitles them to the use of the sludge-channel for four hours every day; but they have made a concession which enables all parties to work. The three-hour system of shifts has been introduced, which apparently gives satisfaction to all; this, however, can only continue during the summer months. A grant of priority would have the effect of throwing twelve parties idle; the sludge-channel being only equal to provide for eighteen parties in three shifts of four hours, or twenty-four parties in four shifts of three hours. The remedy we would suggest would be that Government should be asked to provide increased accommodation for those using the sludge-channel by constructing another tail-race.

Trusting the above will receive your attention,

We remain,

Your obedient servants,

ALEXANDER MILLER,

For — PRICE and Party of	8 Men.
CHARLES HOOD and Party of	5 „
J. P. THOMAS and Party of	7 „
H. McMASTERS and Party of	6 „
THOS. ROBINSON and Party of	6 „
STEPHEN McNEILL and Party of	5 „
W. BAIN and Party of	6 „
JAMES CONAGHAN and Party of	6 „
MICHAEL GINTY and Party of	6 „
GILBERT ROBERTS and Party of	6 „

61 Men.

The Chairman and Members of the Gold Fields Committee,
Wellington.

MEMORANDUM for the UNDER-SECRETARY, MINES DEPARTMENT, Wellington.

Re *Priority of Permits, &c., Kumara Sludge-channel.*

WITH reference to Alexander Miller's letter of the 6th instant on behalf of sixty-one miners who have permits to use the sludge-channel at Kumara, I have the honour to report on the same as follows:—

The first portion of the letter refers to the priority of rights to use the sludge-channel, and urges on the Government the necessity of upholding the present regulations. The second portion of the letter requests the Government to provide increased channel accommodation. In order that you may understand the questions clearly it will be better to refer to them seriatim.

PRIORITY OF RIGHTS.

The Kumara Sludge-channel was completed in March, 1882, and regulations, consisting of nine clauses, for using it were made and approved on the 17th March of the same year; but the clauses that affect the question of priority are the 5th and 7th.

The 5th clause provides that "No person shall run water or tailings into the sludge-channel, or be employed in any claim from which water and tailings are run, without the written permit of the Manager, stating the name of the person so authorized to use the channel."

Clause 7 provides that, "If the capacity of the sludge-channel shall at any time prove insufficient to carry off the tailings of all the tail-races discharging into it, priority of right to use the said channel is to be determined by the date of the application for the registration of the tail-races."

It will be seen by the clauses, quoted that clause 7 defines that priority to use the channel shall be determined by the date of the application for the registration of the tail-race, and clause 5 distinctly states that no person shall use the channel without a written permit from the Manager; therefore, if the date of the application for the registration of tail-race be taken as the basis to establish priority of use, then there was no great occasion for the provision in clause 5; the written permit of the Manager was not required; but, by reading the clauses conjointly, they appear to convey the meaning that, before any one could use the channel, he had first to obtain a written permit from the Manager, and on that permit there was a period stated that entitled the holder to use the sludge-channel. These permits were in the shape of a contract, entered into by the Manager of the sludge-channel, on behalf of the Government, with the several parties holding such permits, for a stated period, to get the use of the channel on payment of fees as stated in clause 1 of the regulations.

After permits were obtained, clause 7 would seem to imply that priority of use would be determined by the certificate of tail-race; but this can only apply to permits during the time that they are in force. There is no provision for the renewal of permits on the same conditions as the original permits were granted.

After the channel was in use for some time it was found that the first regulations did not provide for all contingencies, and that more parties had tail-races cut into the channel than could be accommodated with their system of working—viz., only using the channel in the daytime. It was deemed advisable to have a fresh code of regulations, doing away with all priority when the term for which permits were given had expired.

The Manager in issuing the first permits numbered them consecutively, and these numbers were held to be the number of priority for the use of the channel; and they have been always treated as such. Therefore, as the permits expired, the other permit-holders expected to be placed forward.

It would be unreasonable to suppose that, if it was found that the first regulations made were not altogether applicable, they should not be repealed, and other regulations made in lieu thereof, so long as any rights taken out under the old regulations were not infringed. That would be the case if the new regulations purported to take away the right of priority from the holders of permits taken out under the old regulations for a stated period. But nothing of this kind is intended. The new regulations only deal with rights acquired since they came into force; and they will be found to give satisfaction to the majority of persons using the sludge-channel, with the suspension of clauses 5 and 16. These clauses are suspended at the present time.

INCREASED CHANNEL ACCOMMODATION.

This is a subject which requires careful consideration. The present channel has been a total failure in a financial point of view, although it serves the purposes of the miners very well. In round numbers it costs the colony £3 to maintain it for £1 that is received in shape of fees from the miners, and any new channel that may be constructed is not likely to become a much more profitable investment. Plans have recently been received from Mr. Seddon, M.H.R., on behalf of the miners at Kumara, of a secondary channel, which they request the Government to construct, in order to relieve the present channel, and allow all parties to work full time.

The present channel would be capable of accommodating all parties if they were to use it night and day continuously; but this the miners say they cannot do, owing to the nature of the ground they are working; although in California, where hydraulic sluicing is carried on in a much more extensive scale, and higher faces, they work day and night continuously. But if the miners only use the channel during the hours of daylight, then it must be at once admitted that its carrying capacity is not sufficient to accommodate all parties who have tail-races cut into it if working full time. The Manager states that he told every one who had a permit above No. 24 that he could not give them permission to cut tail-races into the channel; and, if they did so, they would construct them at their own risk. But merely telling parties this amounts to nothing, inasmuch as they could not have got a certificate from the Warden for their tail-races unless the Manager certified that they could be safely allowed to be connected with the sludge-channel. (*Vide* clause 2 of old regulations.)

The dimensions of tunnel and channel which the miners request to be constructed, consist of one main channel 37 chains long, and two branch channels each 13 chains in length, in accordance with plans and descriptions forwarded, I estimate these would cost about £8,500; but I have since been informed that branch tunnels would only require to be conjointly 15 chains in length, and if such is the case it would reduce the estimate to £7,100. However, I can only make an estimate on the plans and description which have been submitted.

I would strongly recommend that a subsidy up to a certain amount be given the miners to construct it themselves; and to have nothing whatever to do with it beyond seeing that the work is constructed in such a manner that it will be durable in its nature, and give a permanent benefit to a sufficient number of the present claimholders, in order to finally settle the sludge-channel grievance; and that such an amount of subsidy should not be given in money, but by allowing the miners a supply of water up to the amount of the subsidy, after the channel was constructed. This would be a guarantee, to some extent, that the grievance complained of was real, and that the miners had sufficient confidence in the undertaking to justify them in constructing another channel.

SUMMARY.

To summarize: I would recommend that the question of priority of right to use the sludge-channel be left as it stands at present; and that the new regulations be upheld, with clauses 5 and 16 suspended.

And with regard to the question of increased channel accommodation: That the miners be subsidized to a certain extent in water, after the secondary channel is constructed. The Government to have nothing to do with maintenance, or any thing connected with its construction, beyond seeing that it is of a durable nature, and likely to afford permanent relief to such a number of the present claimholders as will settle finally the channel grievance.

Mines Department, Wellington, 16th October, 1884.

HENRY A. GORDON,
Inspecting Engineer.

