

APPENDIX G.

Mr. C. M. TESCHEMAKER to Mr. LARNACH.

DEAR LARNACH,—

Taipo Hill, Mateno, Otago, 15th September, 1877.

You pay the penalty of being a public man by being victimized with this letter. I hear that you are on the Committee of Inquiry *re* Railway Tariff, or whatever the Committee be termed. I am interested in the matter, as follows: I want to take from the Waitaki 14,000 sheep to the Marlborough Province. The sheep must be railed to Amberley—I think the station is called. Well, the charge for a truck holding, say, ninety sheep, is 1s. 6d. per mile for the first ten miles, and 1s. per mile after that.

The cost to me would be £8 for ninety sheep (this is the sum if you calculate the distance), or 1s. 9d. per head. The original cost of the sheep would not be more than 3s., I fancy, or thereabouts.

Say the railway took seventy trucks at £8 each in the day for one goods train, it would receive £560. I think that one-third would amply pay the Government.

Could it not be arranged that for moving large numbers special arrangements can be made?

I am certain that the sheep (14,000) could be driven for less money than 7d. per head. Surely the rail should do it for less. If a reduction such as I suggest were made, numbers of sheep would be moved.

This would probably occur in February, before the grain traffic.

C. M. TESCHEMAKER.

APPENDIX H.

Mr. W. THOMSON to the CHAIRMAN, Railway Management Committee, Wellington.

SIR,—

Christchurch, 29th September, 1877.

I have the honor to enclose copy of my evidence given before Railway Management Committee, which was forwarded to me for correction. I regret not being able to return it sooner, but it was fully a week after my return to Christchurch before it was sent to me.

There are several very important and wide-bearing questions, which, on the spur of the moment, I have not done justice to; and I would also point out that in consequence of some of my answers assuming a conversational character (by reason of interjections of members), they have the appearance of travelling beyond the actual question.

The answers *re* two audits are not very clear to the uninitiated. My meaning is simply this: While a break exists in the communication of the Middle Island railways, and traffic is *not* booked through, an audit in Christchurch and another in Dunedin is absolutely necessary, but as soon as communication is uninterrupted, and through booking commences, two audits would give a deal of trouble.

I would also express my opinion that the traffic department being subject to the engineering department is a mistake, and contrary to common sense and the practice at Home.

The Chairman, Railway Management Committee, Wellington.

I have, &c.,
W. THOMSON.

APPENDIX I.

(In answer to Telegram sent in pursuance of Resolution of Committee.)

W. MILLS, Esq., to the Hon. the COLONIAL SECRETARY, Wellington.

(Telegram.)

STEEL rails are now generally used on our lines, 41½ lbs. to the yard. Our iron rails, same section, were 40 lbs. to the yard. We consider steel rails at present prices, all things taken into account, far superior to iron, and cheaper in the end.

WM. MILLS.

Brisbane, 24th September, 1877.

APPENDIX J.

Mr. W. BRUNTON, C.E., to Mr. E. J. C. STEVENS, M.H.R.

SIR,—

Invercargill, 22nd September, 1877.

Your telegram No. 250, of date 19/9/77, requests answer by first mail. It is short notice, but the following are my views:—

1st. As to relative merits of steel rails compared with iron.

An engine has not the same tractive power on steel rails as she has on iron.

Steel rails, especially with sharp curves, and steep inclines, wear out the wheels of rolling-stock far more than iron.

Steel rails will granulate, and become brittle and dangerous, sooner than iron. The steel points and crossings imported to New Zealand have given proof of this in Southland; they are continually breaking.

In fact, if I was constructing a railway at my own expense, I would certainly not use steel rails. A young and struggling country should not, in my opinion, speculate in anything new; let long experience elsewhere prove it to be advantageous before doing so.

2nd. On being first laid, I should say a steel rail of 40 lbs. weight per yard, laid under the same conditions as an iron rail, would be as secure and efficient, for a time, as an iron one of 15 per cent. increased weight—viz., 46 lbs. per yard.

I think I have made it plain in the above that I am not in any way in favour of steel rails, and can only reiterate such opinion in answering your questions Nos. 3 and 4.