

Parliament, by special legislation, ordered it being vested in the Commissioners. Similarly in the present instance the public convenience requires provision to be made for goods- as well as passenger-traffic at Te Aro, and such being the case provision will be made accordingly

R. J. SEDDON

The Railway Commissioners.

Minister for Public Works.

No 6.

The RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS to the Hon. the MINISTER for PUBLIC WORKS.

New Zealand Government Railways (Head Office), Wellington,
5th April, 1892.

(Memorandum.)

Proposed Goods-station at Te Aro.

THE Railway Commissioners have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th March, intimating that the Government has decided to carry out the construction of a goods-station between Taranaki Street and Clyde Quay. They think this will tend to disadvantageous results financially, and, being inconvenient to work in many ways, they also think it will lead to public dissatisfaction. A division of the traffic will require further capital expenditure on rolling-stock, for which the Government will also require to make provision.

The Commissioners further beg to point out that when Parliament passed the Reclamation Act in 1887, the land at Te Aro then reserved was for a passenger-station only the Government, after discussion with its officers and others, having determined that another goods-station was undesirable. The station question closely affected the interests of the port, and while it was considered necessary to extend the wharfrage accommodation north of the Queen's Wharf, and to provide for adequate railway connection with it, it was also considered necessary to provide for a dock-reserve at Te Aro, which still further restricted the situation.

As regards your reference to the subject of compelling the Railway Commissioners to fulfil their duties, the Commissioners, in forwarding their proposed plan of the station with their letter of the 24th February, believed that they had fulfilled the provisions of the 31st section of the Railways Act in thus deciding the position, character and suitability of the station. They beg to assure you that it is their desire to fulfil their duties thoroughly and to act cordially with the Government and, if any doubt exist as to what the proper functions of the Commissioners may be, they are quite willing, if the Government wishes it, to take the decision of the Solicitor-General to settle the matter, so that the Government may be at no expense or inconvenience.

The Commissioners think you must have been misinformed about Mount Rix Wharf they have at no time refused to take it over. The Government at one time desired to vest the wharf in the Commissioners before it was a part of the railway but they found that they could not do so, nor could the Commissioners exercise control over it until a special Act was passed authorising it. When this was passed, the Commissioners took it over immediately on notification from the Government. The proposal that there should be a second goods-station at Mount Rix, in close vicinity to another erected at a cost of many thousands of pounds, the Commissioners objected to, and it has not been carried out. As to the wharf itself, the Commissioners see no reason to alter their original opinion that a somewhat cheaper structure would have been sufficient for all practical purposes.

The Hon. the Minister for Public Works.

J. P. MAXWELL, Commissioner

No 7

The Hon. the MINISTER for PUBLIC WORKS to the RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

(Memorandum.)

Public Works Department, Wellington, 9th April, 1892.

Re Proposed Goods-station at Te Aro.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Mr Maxwell's memorandum of the 5th instant in further reference to the above-mentioned subject, and although there is very little contained therein that really requires attention, I deem it best to reply fully thereto, lest, through my not doing so, it should be assumed that I concur in the statements made therein.

As regards the question of the probable financial results from, and possible inconveniences in, working of the proposed station at Te Aro, I do not think I need say any more than I have said already, except perhaps that there is no doubt that both points were duly considered by Parliament before the extension of the railway was authorised. As to the public dissatisfaction which the Commissioners seem to anticipate, I really cannot see how anything of the kind can occur if only the Commissioners do their utmost to study the public convenience, otherwise of course dissatisfaction can very easily arise.

Some increased capital expenditure on rolling-stock was looked for, as with a goods-station at Te Aro an increase in the traffic is almost certain to take place. I am particularly pleased to observe that the Commissioners now apparently concur in this view.

Your statement that when Parliament passed the Reclamation Act in 1887, the land at Te Aro then reserved, was reserved for a passenger-station only, must, I think, have been penned without a reference to the Act in question, as after a careful perusal of the same I cannot find any reference therein to either a passenger- or goods-station, the words used (see section 9 of the Act) being "railway station" only which, of course, may mean either a goods- or a passenger-station, or both. Even, however if the Act had expressly provided for land for a passenger-station and no more, I should not have considered that the establishment of a goods-station was thereby prohibited, as the