

line where it is at present. The foreshore must be retained as it is, where it was laid down by Sir John Cooode. If it is allowed to work further back, the efficiency of the port will be seriously affected. With plenty of stone available at the quarries, and a railway-line to them, there is no reason why it should not be maintained where it is. I do not think there is anything further to say.

3. *Hon. Mr. Rolleston.*] You say the line of embankment must be kept there?—Yes.

3A. Is it not in danger when the Harbour Board, as we have been told, are spending £3,000 or £4,000 to secure it?—I should not think an expenditure of that amount was necessary. There is an increased scour in front of the walls beyond the staiths since the training-walls have been advanced down the river; but I understand that is lessening now—it is not as much as it was at first—and it is natural to suppose it will lessen. The first flood after the training-walls were erected showed what was the greatest velocity likely to be experienced, and a considerable scouring took place. The bottom of the river is now making up again to its original depth. Some considerable amount of stone will be required, but only in ordinary maintenance.

4. Has not the river at different times entirely falsified the expectations of engineers?—Not as far as I know. The results have been as they were expected to be, at Westport.

5. Have they been so at Greymouth, for instance?—Practically, at the Grey.

6. You say it will be absolutely provided for in this case?—I am quite satisfied it will be.

7. *Mr. Rhodes.*] Have you any idea what they are spending at present?—At present I do not know that there has been anything. I believe the work is in the hands of the Railway Commissioners. I believe what they purpose doing is driving piles, which is very necessary, no doubt, but I do not know whether they have commenced operations.

8. *Mr. Hogg.*] Since the staiths were constructed, have the banks of the river been seriously encroached on?—Not at all.

9. Was any large expenditure incurred to protect the banks?—None. The banks of the river were pitched with stone when the station-yard was first erected in 1877–78, and that stone is practically unaltered. It has stood since.

10. *Mr. Meredith.*] I understand, from evidence given yesterday, that the trend of the river is in this direction, and the scour is working its way up, with the probability of undermining the piles driven under the face of this wharf; and in consequence of the danger the Railway Department incur an annual expenditure of about £1,400* with a view of driving a considerable number of piles deeper into the ground so that the effect of the scour may be restrained. Is that correct?—Practically correct.

11. Then the scour is practically in the direction of the wharf?—The velocity of the current is considerably against the wharves, which are protected by the stone pitching. It is perfectly right to protect with piles. It is essentially right, but the new portion of the staiths has not been affected by the river at all, only the old portion built in 1877–78. This scour was not foreseen then, and, as in many cases the piles were not driven quite deep enough, this will be remedied by the work mentioned, and the banks of the river maintained.

12. How long is it since you had an opportunity of seeing it?—I have not seen Westport since May last.

13. *Mr. O'Connor.*] Would you be good enough to distinguish between the scour and the encroachment on the banks; showing the scour and the purpose for which the wall was put in?—To deepen the river for vessels? Yes.

14. In your evidence you did not state that the training-wall caused a scour, and effected a deepening of the river?—It is doing that now.

15. Do you think there is a necessity for the piles being made to support the staiths? Is it necessary for the traffic, and to protect the Colliery Reserve?—I do not think there is any danger to the reserve.

16. In your remarks, Mr. Wilson, you described a portion of the reserve that would be sufficient to store a million and a quarter tons of coal: do you include in that the portion to the east of the railway?—No. It could, however, be more easily obtained for the purpose than the sections on Palmerston Street.

17. If it was thought necessary to increase the area well above what you say, would it not be easy to obtain all this from Wakefield Street right along the railway-line to Bentham Street? Could that not be easily obtainable?—I believe it could be obtained.

18. Could the other blocks, now in the hands of the Government, not be obtained for the purpose of storing coal?—They could probably be obtained.

19. You are aware these reserves are in the hands of the Government; could they be as available for the purposes of storing coal as other parts of the reserve?—This part would, to the west of Adderley Street. There is the railway embankment here, which would make it rather awkward to get at the other part. I believe it could be made use of; if not for storing trucks, then for shop purposes.

20. *The Chairman.*] That is not the question. Is there any large storage provided for at Mokihinui, Waimangaroa, and Granity?—At present the storage at Mokihinui is for about fifty wagons, and perhaps one hundred at Waimangaroa. I dare say there is another hundred at Granity; there is a large siding there.

21. *Mr. O'Connor.*] Are you aware what the anchorage is that is available for loading vessels; how many vessels could lie at Westport?—Say twelve vessels.

22. Is there any difficulty even now in the river—without double-banking the boats—with the small trade of the present time, when the river is in flood?—They can lie one outside the other.

23. Is not that a dangerous proceeding?—I cannot say I think it is very dangerous, so long as it stands at two boats; and there is good moorage on shore.

* I understood Mr. Meredith to say “an expenditure of about £1,400,” not “an ANNUAL expenditure of about £1,400.” It was on that supposition I answered. I know nothing of an annual expenditure of that amount.—J.A.W.