imate cost of £~~70~~ 1000 per acre—having no earning value, yet chargeable with compound interest, local rates, and land tax.

If we dump the silt into the sea we have aproximately **£70,000** in **cash,** less the cost of the steam barge, whilst if we make the comparison after the 40 foot depth of water is obtained we will have over £100,000 saved and the steam barge paid for.

It may be contended that the land will advance its value. Quite so. Then wait till land is proved to be valuable before reclaiming it. There will always be plenty of silt available for the purpose. There will then be no need for regret to be expressed at looking at an unfinished structure, because there will be a feeling of satisfaction that it may be made useful some time.

(2.) **Increased cost of dredging means increased levying of wharfage rates.**

In 1910, the first year of the construction of the mole, wharfage was raised and deputations applied to the Board to abate the increase. The expenditure on the mole has averaged £6,000 per annum since. If this was stopped and the silt was deposited at sea, assume that the annual quantity raised would be 1,000,000 tons, then the money saved at 3½d. per ton would amount to £14,100, which could be abated on wharfage.

But the present Reclamation Scheme cannot be carried out. The mole won't be finished till 1919. It will hold only 4½ years' dredged silt. What are they going to do then? But long before that they will have to stop pumping silt in, for even **now** it is beginning to float out.

What is the remedy? Simply this, that if the Lyttelton Harbour Board is not amenable to moral suasion then the Mayor of Christchurch should apply to the Supreme Court for a **mandamus to compel the Board to stop wasting the public money.** Contemporaneously with this there should be a vigorous effort made to get a Bill passed giving Christchurch an **equitable representation on the Board** so as to **prevent wasteful expenditure in the future.**

FIGURES SUPPLIED TO SUBSTANTIATE STATEMENTS MADE IN THE BODY OF THE PAMPHLET.

Estimated cost of constructing a mole to enclose the area to be reclaimed by depositing dredged silt, cost of depositing silt therein, and compound interest on the money paid during construction.

Length of proposed mole .. .. 3,400 feet
Area enclosed thereby .. .. 70 acres
Estimated quantity of silt contained therein 4,538,200 tons
Commenced tipping on the mole 8th November, 1909.

	feet.	Cost.
Constructed up to November, 1911 ..	903	£13,030
Constructed during 1912	297	5,818
Total ..	1,200	£18,848

Balance to construct at estimated cost of £20 per foot	2,200	44,000
	3,400	
Estimated cost of filling in with 4,538,200 tons at 1.76 pence per ton ..		33,280
		96,128
Compound Interest on £9,612, being one-tenth of cost for 10 years, as per Inwood's tables		21,986
Estimated cost of reclaimed land ..		£118,114

Estimated Time of Construction of Mole.

Constructed during 1912: 297 feet. The assessed rate of construction for the remaining 2,200 is taken at 300 feet per annum. This is assumed to be reasonable, bearing in mind that the depth of water increases as the work proceeds. Thus the 2,200 feet is assumed to be completed in 7 years—say by the end of 1919, or 10 years time for the whole construction.

The reclamation area being estimated to contain 4,538,200 tons at a cost of £118,114—the cost per ton works out at 6.24 per ton.

Now compare this with the cost of depositing **silt at sea three miles outside the Heads.**

Cost of pumping into the hoppers of the dredge and steam barge alongside her is taken at .58 pence, being one-third of the cost, 1.76 pence per ton, stated in the Annual Report for 1912—for raising and depositing the silt in the reclamation area—thus	.58
Cost of conveying silt to sea 7 miles as per Annual Report, 1912 (page 12), .3 pence per ton per mile ..	2.1
	2.68
Balance saved by depositing at sea	3.56
Total cost per ton depositing in the area ..	6.24

In order to get an idea of the saving that would accrue to the Lyttelton Harbour Board by depositing the dredged silt at sea instead of reclaiming land with it an estimate should be made of the probable quantity of silt to be raised in order to get 40 feet depth of water in the Inner Harbour and Outer Passage. That being the goal we should first contend for.