

In forwarding the Bacteriologist's report to the City Council I said, "The presence of the *Bacillus coli* shows that matter of an excremental character gains access to the water-mains, presumably from the dust from street-deposits which collects on the roof of the Ponsonby reservoir. It is therefore for your Council to decide whether it would not be as well to have the drainage from the roof of the reservoir diverted from its present course, or, better still, to remove the reservoir from the centre of the densely populated portion of the city, where it is always liable to pollution, even though by efficient covering this risk be reduced to a minimum."

It is gratifying to be able to say that plans have since been submitted to the Department whereby the first suggestion will be carried out.

In my last report I referred to the pumping-up of polluted sea-water from the harbour to the Albert Street Baths. Then the matter waited, "With a strong recommendation to the incoming Council that the report of the City Engineer and Waterworks Engineer thereon be adopted." That recommendation was not accepted. Once again a *laissez faire* is adopted, and this is the reply I receive: "In reply to your letter of the 20th July asking the Council's intention as to obtaining salt water for streets and baths, I have the honour to inform you that, while approving of the proposal to obtain the cleanest salt water possible, yet in view of the contemplated works of the Harbour Board in regard to the wharves the Council cannot see its way in the meantime to incur any large expense in extending the water-pipes under the wharves." In the meantime, while no single Councillor would himself bathe or allow his children to bathe near the dock-entrance, the intake of the salt water, yet the same water after deleterious incubation—not the cleanest salt water possible—is considered still to be good enough for the frequenters of the City Baths.

The smoke nuisance is a perpetual annoyance. The Stipendiary Magistrates, Messrs. Kettle and Dyer, wrote, "When the wind is blowing from the east this building—Magistrate's Court—is enveloped with smoke, and we are therefore unable to open the Court windows for the purpose of ventilation. At present the matter is being dealt with by the Council, but in the meantime an extension of time of six months, dating from November, 1905, has been granted to enable offenders to apply remedial measures."

In connection with the effecting of improvements when necessary where infectious disease had been notified the same tendency to *laissez faire* by the city sanitary officers was evidenced. A more enlivened state of things now exists as the result of frequent attention being drawn to details which had not in my opinion received adequate recognition.

In August, 1905, I wrote drawing attention to the offensiveness and nuisance caused by want of proper cab-stands. I continued, "What is required are central cab-stands properly built, with drainage towards a central channel conducted to a central trapped sewer-inlet, and access to a water-pipe at some point beneath the cab-stand to which a hose-pipe can be conveniently attached, so that the stand may be flushed down at intervals." A reply was received which, while not denying the statement made, yet put off the matter on account of the possibility of laying down the streets in question in asphalt, and because no provision had been made on the estimates for the extra work. A second appeal, in February of this year, procured me the information that "In view of the possibility of an early consideration of the advisability of extending the Neuchatel asphalt in Fort and other streets in the vicinity, the matter of laying down new cab-stands is deferred meantime."

Last year I said, in connection with the then initiated nightsoil contract, "Nine months almost have passed, and yet the contractor has not fulfilled these conditions in their entirety: how much has really been done properly it is hard to tell." The succeeding twelve months have shown a complete absence of success on the part of the City Council in compelling the contractor to accurately fulfil the terms of his contract with them—not that the desire to do so was ever masterful. Fines amounting to £60 10s. in eighteen months have been of no avail. It would be tantamount to untruth to say clean disinfected pans have been returned to the householders during the year. The circulation of indifferently cleaned pans which have at any time become infected by typhoid stools may contribute to the enteric-féver rate. I quote from the Press report of one of the Councillors' remarks at a Council meeting in February, 1906. He said, "That the health of the community was menaced by the manner in which the service was carried out. It was useless to wait for a drainage scheme, since that matter might be hung up for years. Every night complaints were being made. Fines were inflicted, but what was the use of it?" The question of the taking-over of the service by the Council has received consideration, but again no satisfactory decision has been arrived at.

Many complaints were received by the Waitemata County Council as to the nuisance caused by the disposal of the nightsoil at Harkin's Point. In response to their request legal action was taken by me with a view to proving to the contractor that he was not lawfully established at that place. This case was withdrawn on his admitting the contention and paying the amount of legal costs asked for. At Christmas, however, an abominable state of things was caused in the upper reaches of the Waitemata by the tipping of nightsoil into the river. Again action was taken, the contractor pleaded guilty to four charges, and was convicted and fined £20 10s., and costs amounting to £13 18s. 6d. The contractor has signified his inability to carry out the first and most important of thirteen requirements made by me, and I so far see no other course but to stop the use of Harkin's Point before next summer.

After nearly five years' delay the destructor has been in working-order for some time, and so far fulfils the essential requirements of effectually disposing of the rubbish and without nuisance. Large volumes of steam have been allowed to go to waste, much to the annoyance of the residents. This could have been used for steam disinfection. A disinfector was included in the proposals for the erection of the destructor, but was deleted by the Council. I have asked that such be provided. I reported *inter alia* as follows: "I am not at all satisfied that the disinfection of infected things can ever be satisfactory without an efficient disinfector. Fortunately, the infectious-disease rate at present is extremely low; but your Council will appreciate the crude methods which are at present only available,