

which was asserted to be fully 10ft. higher than either the plans or the report of Sir John Coode would justify, as I would undoubtedly discover if I measured or observed it carefully. Having gone carefully over both the plans and the works with Mr. Scott, I was for some time at a loss to account for the alleged discrepancy, but at length discovered the meaning of the assertion. Sir John Coode's report was again quoted; it runs as follows, viz., "*North Breakwater*. . . . 650ft. of which would be formed as a rubble end-tip, the remainder of this breakwater, 630ft., would be rubble deposited from a staging in the same manner as the outermost part of the corresponding work on the south side, excepting that in this, as in the case of the north training bank, the top should terminate at the level of high water of neap tides." This was interpreted by the writer of the letter to mean that, at the end of the 650ft. formed as a rubble end-tip about 10½ft. above high-water neap-tides, the work should suddenly and at once drop down to high-water line neap-tides, whereas the plans show that it is not so intended to drop down suddenly, but by a gradual slope of 1 in 30, and according to this plan the works are being carried out.

Taking, therefore, the report alone as a guide, there is ground for the assertion that some part of the north breakwater is being built 10ft. too high; but, taking the report and the illustrative plans together, there is no foundation for the assertion. I feel it satisfactory that I have been able to clear up these reports as to the manner in which the works were being carried out.

The Hon. the Minister for Public Works.

JOHN BLACKETT.

P.S.—Attached is a tracing showing works as actually constructed, 28th February, 1888, M.D. 1398.

[*Approximate Cost of Paper*.—Preparation, nil; printing (1,275 copies), £3 3s.]

By Authority: GEORGE DIDSBURY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1888.