

1927.
NEW ZEALAND.

REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

APPOINTED TO INQUIRE INTO AND REPORT UPON

HARBOUR BOARD MATTERS
AT NAPIER.



WELLINGTON.
BY AUTHORITY: W. A. G. SKINNER, GOVERNMENT PRINTER.

—
1927.

1927.

NEW ZEALAND

REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION

APPOINTED TO ENQUIRE INTO THE MATTER

HARBOR BOARD MATTERS

AT NAPIER

WELLINGTON

BY AUTHORITY OF THE GOVERNMENT

1927

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
WARRANT OF APPOINTMENT AND ORDER OF REFERENCE	1
REPORT :—	
Part 1—Preliminary	4
Part 2—Opening of Sittings	4
Part 3—Legal Assistance	4
Part 4—Reporting	4
Part 5—Length of Sitting	5
Part 6—Number of Witnesses; Form of Evidence	5
Part 7—Status of Engineering Reports	5
Part 8—Brief History of Port and its Present State	6
Part 9—Physical Features of District and Natural Forces arising therefrom.. .. .	13
Physical Features	13
River Action	13
Artesian Water-supply	13
Littoral Features	13
Natural Forces; Ocean Currents	14
Littoral Drift	14
Sea and Wave Drift	14
Tidal Currents in and out of Lagoons	14
Part 10—Development, in various Reports of Theories based on those Physical Features and Natural Forces in Relation to Harbour-construction	15
Littoral Drift	15
Shingle Drift	15
Sand Drift	16
Our Conclusions on the Question of Sand Drift	17
Part 11 (a)—A Brief Description of the Breakwater Harbour	19
(a) As to Locality	19
(b) As to Constructional Details	19
(c) As to Relation to Existing Transport Facilities and Termini	19
Part 11 (b)—A Brief Description of the Inner Harbour	20
(a) As to Locality	20
(b) As to Constructional Details	20
(c) As to Relation to Existing Transport Facilities and Termini	20
Part 11 (c)—The Roadstead	20
Part 12—Is it practicable (in view of Reports and our Investigations) to construct a Harbour suitable for the Requirements of the Napier Harbour Rating District as at present constituted at the Inner Harbour and at the Breakwater?	22
(a) Inner Harbour	22
(b) Breakwater	23
Part 13—If so, which is to be recommended as providing the Best and most Suitable Harbour from an Engineering, Navigational, and Economic Point of View?	23
Inner Harbour or Breakwater Harbour from an Engineering Point of View	24
Dredging	25
Inner and Breakwater Harbours from the Navigational Point of View	26
Breakwater Harbour from Navigational Standpoint	27
Summary of Evidence	27
Use of Tug	27
Inner or Breakwater Harbour from Economic Point of View	27
Economic Conditions as affecting Inner and Outer Harbour Development	30
Part 14—Can the Expenditure of the Money necessary to construct the Recommended Harbour (taking into Account the Amount already expended) be justified from the Financial and Economic Aspect?	31
(1) Economic Survey of the Trade, Industry, and Resources of Hawke's Bay	32
(2) Exports	32
(3) Comparison with other Ports	32
(4) Exports, Potential—	
(a) Dairy-products	33
(b) Hemp	34
(5) Imports	34
(6) Industrial	34
(7) Past Shipping Records	34
(8) General	36
(9) Economic Conclusion	36
(10) Analysis of Financial Position	36
(11) Fixed Assets	37
(12) Cash Assets	37
(13) Liabilities	37

REPORT—continued.

Part 14—continued.

	PAGE
(14) Loans and Contingent Liabilities.. .. .	37
(15) Essential Works in Progress or contemplated	38
(16) Inner Harbour	38
(17) Outer Harbour	38
(18) Works in Progress	38
(19) Works contemplated	38
(20) Glasgow Wharf	38
(21) Revenue and Expenditure	38
(22) Revenue	39
(23) Expenditure	39
(24), (25), (26) Comments on Revenue and Expenditure	39
(27) Sources of Revenue	40
(28), (29), (30) Wharfage	40
(31) Charges and Dues	40
(32) Rentals from Land	40
(33) Rates	41
(34) Harbour Improvement Rate	41
(35), (36) Roadstead Cargo and Lighterage	41
(36A) Annual Revenue Accounts	41
(37) Capital Cost of Harbour-works	42
(38) Schedule of Expenditure	42
(39) Valuation of Harbours	42
(40), (41) Inner Harbour Loan Expenditure	42
(42) Outer Harbour Loan Expenditure	43
(43) Financial Conclusion	43
(44)-(47) Summary of Commercial and Economic Report	43
Part 15—Should Legislation be revoked?	44
Part 16—Is it advisable?	45
Part 17—Is there any other Scheme which you can recommend in Preference to those mentioned in No. 11 above, as providing said District with the Accommodation and Facilities required?	45
Part 18—Are Port Dues, Berthage Dues, Wharfage Dues, Charges for Labour, and Other Charges at the Present Time and according to Harbour Act and By-laws imposed in an Equitable Manner between Different Parts of Harbour, Different Classes of Ships, and Different Classes of Persons?	47
Part 19—Reclamation Problem	47
General Description of Areas	47
Method of Reclamation	48
Conflicting Interests	48
Effect on Housing Conditions	49
Napier's Requirements	50
The Hawke's Bay Rivers Board	51
Reclamation as Propaganda	51
Costs of Reclamation	52
Methods of Reclamation	52
Dewatering Method	53
Raising Land by Deposit of Spoil	53
Treatment of Salt Lands	54
Conclusions	54
Order in which Blocks should be reclaimed	54
Potential Values of Reclaimed Land	55
Expenses	56
Recommendation	56
Aggregate Cost of Reclamation	58
Aggregate Rentals from Reclaimed Land	58
Part 20—Alleged Non-submission of Plans of Proposed Work: Has the Harbours Act, 1923, Sections 168-171, been complied with?	59
Part 21—Proposed Refund by State to Harbour Board of Part Cost of Railway and Road Embankment	61
Part 22—Constitution of Harbour Board and Representation thereon	62
Contract Prices and Day Labour	62
Part 23—Cost of Inquiry	63
Part 24—Harbour Board Officials and Staff	63

APPENDIX TO REPORT:—

	TABLE
List of Newspapers in which Notice of Sittings was advertised	A
Days on which Sittings were held	B
Witnesses who appeared before Commission	C
List of Exhibits	D
List of Printed Reports studied by the Commission and now comprised in Commission's Exhibit No. 1	E
Mr. A. C. Mackenzie's Report on Dredging	F
Mr. A. C. Mackenzie's Estimated Cost to Complete Inner Harbour.. .. .	G
Mr. A. C. Mackenzie's Estimated Cost to Complete Breakwater Harbour	H
Short Summary of Navigation Expert's Evidence.. .. .	J
Plans and Maps comprised in Commission's Exhibit No. 3	K

1927.

NEW ZEALAND.

NAPIER HARBOUR BOARD MATTERS

(REPORT OF ROYAL COMMISSION ON).

Presented to both Houses of the General Assembly by Command of His Excellency.

COMMISSION

TO INQUIRE INTO AND REPORT UPON HARBOUR BOARD MATTERS AT NAPIER.

CHARLES FERGUSSON, Governor-General.

To all to whom these presents shall come, and to JOHN SAXON BARTON, Esquire ;
ARTHUR CECIL MACKENZIE, Esquire ; and JOHN BIGGAR WATERS, Esquire :
Greeting.

WHEREAS it is provided by section two of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1908, that the Governor-General in Council may appoint any person or persons to be a Commission to inquire into and report upon, *inter alia*, any question arising out of the administration of the Government, or the working of any existing law, or regarding the necessity or expediency of any proposed legislation :

And whereas by the Napier Harbour Board Empowering and Loan Act, 1884, the Napier Harbour Board (hereinafter called "the Board") was duly authorized, subject to the provisions of the Harbours Act, 1878, to construct such harbour-works as should be by the Board considered necessary for the requirements of the Harbour of Napier, and the Board did, pursuant to such authority, duly proceed with the construction of the harbour-works known as the Breakwater Harbour at Napier :

And whereas by the Napier Harbour Board Empowering and Loan Act, 1914, the Board was, subject to the provisions of the Harbours Act, 1908, and of the said Act of 1914, duly authorized to construct such harbour-works as should by the Board be considered necessary for the requirements of the Harbour of Napier in and about the construction, completion, development, and improvement of the Inner Harbour portion of the said harbour, but has not, as required by the Harbours Act, 1908, submitted plans of the proposed works for the approval of the Governor-General in Council except in so far as relates to the reconstruction of certain existing works :

And whereas it appears to the Government that it is expedient to appoint a Commission to make inquiry into and report regarding the question as to whether the authority to construct wholly or in part the works specified in the Napier Harbour Board Empowering and Loan Act, 1914, should be continued in force and the work authorized in due course, or whether legislation should be enacted

to revoke the said authority, wholly or in part, and also to inquire into and report as to the most practicable scheme, having regard to all relevant considerations, for the construction of a harbour suitable for the requirements of the Hawke's Bay District :

And whereas a Bill intituled the Napier Harbour Board Empowering and Loan Bill, 1926, purporting to authorize the Board to reclaim certain areas of land therein described, was during the last session of Parliament introduced thereinto, but after consideration thereof was not allowed to proceed, and it is expedient that a Commission should be appointed to inquire into and report as to the necessity or expediency of the proposed legislation and as to the other matters hereinafter set out :

Now, therefore, I, General Sir Charles Fergusson, Baronet, Governor-General of the Dominion of New Zealand, in exercise of the hereinbefore-recited powers and of all other powers and authorities enabling me in this behalf, and acting by and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council of the said Dominion, do hereby appoint you, the said

JOHN SAXON BARTON,
ARTHUR CECIL MACKENZIE, and
JOHN BIGGAR WATERS

to be a Commission to inquire into and report upon the following questions :—

1. (a) Whether, in view of reports already furnished and of any further investigations which you may see fit to make, it is practicable to construct a harbour suitable for the requirements of the Napier Harbour Rating District as at present constituted (a) at the Inner Harbour, or (b) at the breakwater.
 - (b) If so, which of such schemes you would recommend as providing the best and most suitable harbour from an engineering, navigational, and economic point of view.
 - (c) Whether the expenditure of the money necessary to construct such a harbour, taking into account the amount already expended, can be justified from the financial and economic aspect.
 - (d) Whether, taking into account all relevant considerations, it is advisable that such a harbour be constructed.
 - (e) Whether, in view of all the circumstances, there is any other scheme which you can recommend in preference to those mentioned in paragraph (a) above, as providing for the said district the accommodation and facilities required.
 - (f) Whether the reclamation of the areas described in the First and Second Schedules to the Napier Harbour Empowering and Loan Bill, 1926, or any other areas within or adjacent to the Harbour of Napier and the lands vested in the Napier Harbour Board, should be authorized, and, if so, to what extent, and by what arrangement can any such reclamation be most economically and satisfactorily accomplished.
2. Whether at the present time, according to the working of the existing law (namely, the Harbours Act, 1923, and by-laws made thereunder), the port dues, berthage dues, wharfage dues, charges for labour and on goods, and other charges which the Board is empowered to levy, are imposed in a manner operating equitably as between different classes of ships, and as between the different parts of the harbour in which ships are or may be worked, and as between the different classes of persons liable pursuant to the Harbours Act, 1923, for payment of the said respective dues.
 3. And generally to inquire into and report upon the premises and any matter arising thereout which may come under your notice in the course of your inquiries and which you consider should be investigated in connection therewith.

And with the like advice and consent I do hereby appoint you, the said

JOHN SAXON BARTON

to be the Chairman of the said Commission.

And you are hereby authorized to conduct any inquiry under these presents at such times and places as you deem expedient, with power to adjourn from time to time and place to place as you think fit, and to call before you and to examine on oath or otherwise such persons as you think capable of affording you information as to the matters aforesaid, and to call for and examine all such books, papers, writings, documents, and records as you deem likely to afford you the fullest information on any such matters :

And, using all due diligence, you are required to report to me, under your hands and seals, not later than the thirty-first day of August, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-seven, your opinion on the aforesaid matters.

And you are hereby strictly charged and directed that you shall not at any time publish or otherwise disclose, save to me in pursuance of these presents or by my direction, the contents or purport of any report so made or to be made by you.

And it is hereby declared that this Commission shall continue in full force and virtue although the inquiry be not regularly continued from time to time or place to place by adjournment.

And I further direct you, having regard to the local scope of this Commission, to consider what sums representing the whole or any portion of the costs of your inquiry should be borne by the Harbour Board and by the respective corporate bodies represented by the local authorities of any district lying wholly or partly within the Napier Harbour Rating District as now constituted, and any other corporate body or individual, or by any of them, and to make provision for citation of parties and orders for payment of costs accordingly pursuant to the powers conferred by the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1908.

And, lastly, it is hereby further declared that these presents are issued under and subject to the provisions of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1908.

[L.S.] Given under the hand of His Excellency the Governor-General of the Dominion of New Zealand, and issued under the Seal of that Dominion, this twenty-fifth day of July, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-seven.

Approved in Council.

G. JAS. ANDERSON,
Minister of Marine.

F. D. THOMSON,
Clerk of the Executive Council.

REPORT.

To His Excellency the Governor-General, Dominion of New Zealand.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

PART I.—PRELIMINARY.

We were each advised by letter during the month of July of our respective appointments to this Commission, and in due course we received Your Excellency's Warrant of appointment and the order of reference. We thereupon caused public notice of the appointment and of our intention of entering on the hearing of the matters embodied in the order of reference to be given. This notice took the form of advertisements setting out the time and the place of hearing, a brief outline of the scope of the inquiry, and an invitation to interested parties and persons, able by evidence to assist the Commission, to place themselves in communication with us. These advertisements were duly published in the newspapers, a list of which appears in Table A in the appendix hereto.

PART 2.—OPENING OF SITTINGS.

The place appointed for the sittings was the Council Chamber of the Napier Borough Council, and the Mayor of the borough very kindly placed his room at our disposal as an office where we could meet for our private conferences, and for our work whilst we were not actually in session. We arrived in Napier on Wednesday, the 3rd August, and the Commission was duly opened at 10.30 a.m. on Thursday, the 4th August, 1927. Each of us took his seat at the opening and was present throughout the whole of the sittings. On the inquiry being declared open at 10.30 a.m. on the 4th August the Chairman read Your Excellency's Warrant of appointment and the order of reference, and thereafter that document was left available for inspection by all responsible interested parties.

PART 3.—LEGAL ASSISTANCE.

Mr. A. Gray, K.C., appeared, with Mr. Grant, for the Napier Harbour Board, and Mr. H. B. Lusk appeared for the Marine Department, throughout the inquiry, and at the later stages, to put before the Commission also the views of the Napier Borough Council on the matter of land-reclamation.

Although the appearance of counsel is thus recorded it should be stated that the proceedings were not conducted in the ordinary way of litigation between contesting parties. Mr. Gray announced at the opening that his instructions from the Harbour Board were to call witnesses for the assistance of the Commission without respect to their standing in the matter of the parties which have arisen on the Harbour Board out of divergent views as to the best policy of harbour-construction. In pursuance of this policy Mr. Gray put forward as his first witness Mr. A. E. Jull, Chairman of the Harbour Board, a strong supporter of the Inner Harbour policy which commands the votes of the majority of the Harbour Board as at present constituted, and as his second witness Mr. P. F. Higgins, a member of the Harbour Board who just as strongly advocates the breakwater harbour policy, which is acceptable to the minority of the Harbour Board at present. Mr. Lusk made a statement on behalf of the Minister for Marine to the effect that there was nothing further from the Minister's wishes than that the Commission should be made the occasion of a personal conflict between persons holding different views, or that there should be any expressions of personal antagonism. The Minister desired him to say also that all questions of mistakes either of policy or administration should be avoided. If there had been any such mistakes, their realization would be to the benefit of the district, and no good purpose would be served by ventilating them now. It was for the good of the community that they should be allowed to rest.

PART 4.—REPORTING.

With the assistance of the Public Service Commissioner and the Justice Department, the services of the Clerk of the Magistrate's Court at Napier had been made available as Clerk to the Commission; whilst the services of Mr. Martin, of the Magistrate's Court at Napier, were placed at our disposal as a reporter to take a verbatim report of the evidence direct on the typewriter. This proved to be a satisfactory method of recording the evidence, and throughout Mr. Martin was able to take an accurate record at a speed representing the utmost of our ability to understand, assimilate, and collate the evidence. We think it right that we should here place on record the fact also that three local newspapers were represented at the inquiry throughout, and these papers all published the most excellent reports day by day of the proceedings. These reports were marked by fullness, clearness, and fairness, and we have every reason to believe that they stimulated and fed a marked public interest in the matter of the inquiry and the evidence tendered, and we believe that they have performed a most marked public service in making the constituents of the Napier Harbour Board better acquainted with the facts underlying the harbour problem than they have ever been before.

PART 5.—LENGTH OF SITTING.

The Commission, after a formal opening on Thursday, the 4th August, adjourned until 10 a.m. the next day, spending the remainder of the 4th August in a study of the topography and geography of the district and the existing state of the harbour-works. Beginning on Friday, the 5th August, at 10 o'clock, we sat continuously until Tuesday, the 13th September, at 5 p.m., when we formally adjourned the sittings to 2 p.m. on Monday, the 19th September, 1927, at the Conference-room of the Dominion Farmers' Institute at Wellington. At this time and place the evidence of two witnesses was taken, and Mr. A. Gray, K.C., for the Harbour Board, and Mr. H. B. Lusk for the Marine Department, addressed us on matters of law arising out of the order of reference and of the question of the incidence of the costs of the whole proceedings. We set out in Table B in the appendix a detailed list of the days and hours on which we sat at Napier and Wellington.

PART 6.—NUMBER OF WITNESSES, FORM OF EVIDENCE.

We heard in all forty-seven witnesses; we set out in Table C in the appendix hereto a list of these witnesses, giving opposite the name of each the representative capacity in which he appeared. Several of these witnesses were recalled subsequently to their first appearance, some of them being called more than twice. It is obvious that to preserve logical sequence it would have been better if this recalling could have been avoided, but in the very nature of the case and in the circumstances under which we sat it was unavoidable. Much of the evidence was highly technical, and most of this evidence was put forward by witnesses whose minds were made up in support of one or other of the rival harbour schemes. This meant that when such evidence was tendered one or other of the counsel engaged would require to cross-examine, and, in preparation for such cross-examination, to consult with his own expert witnesses. Furthermore, the engineering member of the Board of Commissioners required time to read and re-read the evidence of engineering witnesses and consider this evidence before considering himself able effectively to question such witnesses. We were anxious to avoid delay in unduly prolonging the hearing, and we therefore filled in the intervals by calling other witnesses. Further, many witnesses were called from Wellington, and they attended at Napier in answer to the Chairman's summons. It was not possible to time their arrivals with the stage of the proceedings where their evidence could be best fitted in to preserve logical sequence, whilst, on the other hand, we were strongly desirous of saving the expenditure of public money as much as possible by taking their evidence soon after their arrivals, and releasing them. Furthermore, as the case developed and more and more engineering and navigational evidence was brought out, the necessity of calling rebutting evidence arose, and counsel desirous of tendering this rebutting evidence had to rely on witnesses who had already appeared in the witness-box. These facts account for the admittedly disjointed record presented by the official record of the evidence, and it has undoubtedly added to our difficulty in grasping and assimilating the evidence, but it was in all the circumstances unavoidable. The official record of the evidence is contained on 626 typewritten sheets, and there was tendered in support of this evidence 177 exhibits, some of them being of a composite nature. A list of these exhibits appears as Table D in the appendix hereto.

The form of some of the evidence calls for a further explanation at this stage. After the Commission sat for a little over a fortnight it became apparent that the sittings would last much longer than was at first contemplated, and we therefore discussed the question of ways and means of hastening the process of taking evidence without running the risk of lessening its reliability and value. We therefore wrote to all public bodies who had notified us of their desire to be represented by witnesses at the hearing, and we framed and submitted to them questionnaires, endeavouring to direct the attention of these bodies and their witnesses to the points on which we particularly required information. We further requested that their answers to our questions should be set out in a typed form that would allow it to be incorporated, as originally typed, in our notes of evidence. By arrangement with counsel these typed statements were, as far as possible, accepted, and thus when these witnesses were called a few preliminary questions were put to them, and they then produced, read, and submitted their typewritten statements, and on these they were cross-examined and their answers recorded in the ordinary way. This proceeding involved members of the Commission in a great deal of evening work in framing questions, and in corresponding with prospective witnesses, but it had the advantage of keeping the attention of witnesses concentrated on the precise points at issue, and in saving a great deal of time when the witness was actually in the box.

PART 7.—STATUS OF ENGINEERING REPORTS.

Your Excellency's order of reference directed us in seeking an answer to the questions submitted to us to take into account published reports as well as oral evidence during our investigations, and we did so. The reports dealing with the various aspects of harbour problems and harbour-construction in Napier are very numerous, and they are spread in time over a period of half a century. We set out in Table E of the appendix a list of these reports, showing in each case the name and qualifications of the writer and the approximate date of his report. A complete set of these reports accompanies this report in the form of a single bound volume, identified by the endorsement "Commission's Exhibit No. 1." It will be seen from a perusal of the contents of this volume that we were faced with the task of studying and assimilating a large body of printed matter. This had to be read not once or twice, but, as the evidence tendered before the Commission threw new light on the subject-matter before us, introduced new factors, and opened up fresh points of view, it became necessary for us over and over again to go back to these reports and to make a prolonged study of them. This work had to be undertaken during the period in which we were sitting and receiving and recording evidence, and necessitated our working during practically the whole of our waking hours in the six weeks we were at Napier.

PART 8.—BRIEF HISTORY OF PORT TO ITS PRESENT STATE.

It appears that the first survey of the Ahuriri district was made in the year 1851. The tide at that date flowed in and out of the Ahuriri Lagoon through a natural channel, there being no moles or protective work. In these circumstances the position of the channel from time to time was variable, and its average depth and the position of its deepest channel were subject to constant fluctuations.

In 1862 Mr. Charles Weber was appointed Provisional Engineer for the district, and he was still in that position when, in 1876, the Napier Harbour Act, 1876, was passed, and he became the Resident Engineer to the newly formed Board. He held that position until March, 1879, and on severing his connection with the Board he made a report recording the progress to date in the construction of the port.

In 1873 Mr. McGregor had recommended a breakwater harbour to be built between the Bluff and the Eastern Spit. In 1875 Mr. Carruthers, the Colonial Engineer, had built a test timber groyne to test the question of travelling shingle as affecting the practicability of a breakwater. The result was to cause Mr. Carruthers to report against the construction of the breakwater and to recommend the development of the Inner Port. This work was persevered with when the Harbour Board came into existence in 1876, and between that year and 1878 the east and west piers were built to fix and protect the entrance channel, at a cost of £60,000. Some wharves had been built and some dredging done. Mr. Weber's last official act seems to have been the preparation of a memorandum containing data for the guidance of Sir John Coode, who had been asked to report on and recommend the harbour-works for Napier.

Sir John Coode, M.Inst.C.E., reported in March, 1880, and he joined with Mr. Weber in condemning McGregor's proposed breakwater harbour on the ground that it would inevitably become blocked with shingle and prove a failure. He recommended the extension of the eastern and western piers at the entrance by 400 ft. each, and a deepening of the entrance channel to 10 ft. below low water, spring tides, giving an estimate of the cost of that work, together with a supplementary estimate of the cost of a further instalment of work consisting of the extension by a further 400 ft. of each of the piers and the deepening of the channel to 12 ft.

After receiving Sir John Coode's report the Harbour Board called for competitive designs for the best method of providing a harbour for Napier. A Board of engineers in England was appointed to judge the designs and schemes, their fee being fixed at £600. They awarded the prize of £500 to Mr. W. W. Culcheth, of Victoria, Australia. In his report Mr. Culcheth, in outlining the proposed works for the Inner Harbour, named the third essential as "the maintenance of a depth of 20 ft. at low water in the channel between the moles and in the approaches thereto."

The minutes of the various meetings of the Board in 1882 disclose the extraordinary fact that in the opinion of the Board this design, which had cost £500 as prize-money and £600 as the fee to the English judges, did not meet the requirements of the Harbour Board district, as it contemplated an expected depth of 20 ft. only, and the Board regretted that in giving particulars "the class of vessels to be provided for was not more distinctly stated." No use, therefore, has ever been made of Mr. Culcheth's reports and plans.

Mr. John Goodall, M.Inst.C.E., of Timaru, was next approached, and he was asked to prepare plans and specifications with estimate of cost of a harbour at the Bluff, and in January, 1884, Mr. Goodall made his report to the Napier Harbour Board.

The financial history of the Board at this date was that about £75,000 had been raised and spent on the Inner Harbour. Mr. Goodall in his report condemned the Inner Harbour scheme and recommended the construction of a breakwater at the Bluff. The distinguishing feature of his scheme was the carrying-out of the breakwater from the Bluff at an obtuse angle to the set of the waves of the prevalent seas, so that the waves would run along the wall and be reflected along the beach, the design being that when the breakwater was sufficiently far out the force of the reflected waves would be great enough to drive the shingle back from the works.

This plan was in February, 1884, approved, and legislation was promoted to authorize the construction of the Breakwater Harbour and the raising of the necessary money. The work was commenced in 1886, and in 1909 the breakwater was finished to its present state and condition, but by no means finished according to Mr. Goodall's design. The expenditure on it to that point was £443,840; that included the building of the breakwater and the Glasgow Wharf. In the twenty-five years 1884 to 1909 a further £2,730 had been spent on the Inner Harbour, so that in 1909 the position was—Amount spent on the Inner Harbour, £77,730; amount spent on the Breakwater Harbour, £443,840.*

As already pointed out, the breakwater was not finished according to Goodall's design, and it has continued to the present day in an unfinished state. That this is so is clearly traceable to the fact that the Board has from time to time vacillated between the Inner Harbour and the Breakwater Harbour proposals.

In 1894 a series of storms inflicted damage on the breakwater. On the 7th February, 1894, there occurred what has been described as a storm with a heavy south-easterly swell. This caused

* This amount (£443,840) includes certain sums spent on reclamation of land and on beach protection works, but it was not found practicable to separate these items during our inquiry. They have not been kept separate in the Board's accounts.

a rocking of the structure, crushing the top of the buttress and pushing down the lower part of it. On the 12th April, 1894, a hurricane blew from the north-east, the east, and south-east. Three seas were at times breaking simultaneously on the work. Some of the monoliths were fractured and others destroyed. On the 19th June a heavy south-easterly sea increased the damage to all parts of the structure. In two places portions of the monoliths were washed away, leaving the tops of the blocks appearing just above low water, whilst the monoliths at the end, for a distance of about 96 ft., were entirely destroyed and washed away. Messrs. C. Napier Bell and J. P. Maxwell, M's.Inst.C.E., were instructed to inspect and report on the damage, and the above description of the damage is taken from their report, which is dated 4th September, 1894. It should be noted that in 1894 the breakwater had been constructed only to the shore end of the second curve. Messrs. Bell and Maxwell further reported that although they thought it necessary to strengthen the exposed part of the structure they did not look upon the damage sustained as a serious failure of the work, and added that failure of much greater magnitude has been common in such structures elsewhere. They estimated the cost of repair at £19,000, and recommended the completion of the breakwater to the Auckland Rock, an addition of 1,450 lineal feet.

In May, 1906—that is, whilst the breakwater was still in course of construction, but nearly finished to its present stage—the Board communicated with Mr. J. W. Marchant, C.E., and asked him to report upon harbour-construction for Napier, and to supply plans, estimates, and details of his proposals. He was informed that the Board desired him to consider and report on the question whether the Breakwater Harbour or the Inner Harbour was the most likely to be permanently successful in respect of structure and efficiency as the harbour for the Hawke's Bay District. Mr. Marchant reported in July, 1906. He unhesitatingly condemned the Inner Harbour scheme, and recommended the completion of the breakwater scheme, of which he approved. He considered that the successful construction of the Inner Harbour required the building of a mole or breakwater 5,150 ft. in length to protect the entrance channel, and he considered that the annual cost of dredging and maintaining the full depth of water in the lee of this mole was a matter of conjecture. He concluded: "The completion of the breakwater, its enclosure and equipment, can be confidently recommended as against any project for forming a harbour at the Spit, for reasons stated." The Board adopted Mr. Marchant's recommendation, but on appealing to the ratepayers to sanction the necessary loan the proposal was defeated.

Shortly after this Mr. George Nelson, a member of the Institute of Mechanical Engineers, published a proposal for the improvement of the Inner Harbour, and seems to have spent much time, money, and energy in the furtherance of this project.

The Board, apparently unwilling to act on the advice of Mr. Goodall backed by the advice of Mr. Marchant, decided to get further expert opinion on the matter, and Messrs. J. P. Maxwell, M.Inst.C.E., Mr. Cyrus J. R. Williams, M.Inst.C.E., M.Am.Soc.C.E., and J. Blair Mason, C.E., were asked to report. Their instructions were to trace the history of the port from its inception, and make such local investigations and inquiries as they thought fit to enable them to properly consider and report on the question of the best location and system for construction of a harbour suitable for the Port of Napier and the district served by it, to estimate the cost of carrying out the necessary work and of maintaining the harbour when constructed. They completed their investigations and made a report, which is dated July, 1909. This report appears in the Commission's Exhibit No. 1, beginning at page 103.

These eminent harbour engineers are most emphatic in their condemnation of the Inner Harbour proposal. Like Mr. Marchant, they consider that the entrance channel would need a protective mole. They conclude: "Our final recommendation is that the Board should actively push on the completion of the Breakwater Harbour in accordance with Plan No. 2 attached to this report." Again the Harbour Board approached the ratepayers with the loan proposal to carry out this scheme, and again the proposal was turned down. The floodgates of controversy seem to have been opened about this time, and Mr. George Nelson is much in evidence as an advocate of the Inner Harbour scheme and the uncompromising opposer of the Breakwater Harbour. In September, 1909, the Harbour Board instructed that a letter be sent to Messrs. Maxwell, Williams, and Mason, asking for fuller information on certain points. In their reply Messrs. Maxwell, Williams, and Mason used the strongest and most uncompromising language that professional men writing on their professional subject could possibly employ in condemnation of the projected Inner Harbour scheme. They declared that the proposed entrance channel to the Inner Harbour, being an unprotected channel in the open ocean, was a proposition of the kind that needed only to be stated to display its own refutation on the very face of the statement, and they based this statement on reasons which they gave arising out of their observations of local conditions and their experience of the principles of harbour-construction. This, however, does not seem to have guided the Harbour Board to a conclusion—a state of things that we find the utmost difficulty in understanding and endeavouring to explain. To endeavour to explain it we can only refer to Mr. George Nelson's publication "The Napier Harbour Question," appearing in the Commission's Exhibit No. 1 as pages 43 to 94. Here are to be seen criticisms, offers, challenges, and newspaper correspondence, all apparently from laymen in matters of harbour-construction, and pouring scorn on the conclusions of the experienced engineers who, with a remarkable unanimity, had endeavoured to point the Board to a conclusion. The position is perhaps further explicable by facts which we shall refer to later on; but it may be definitely stated here as a fact that collateral harbour advantages and the apparent excellencies that lie on the surface of a *prima facie* study of the question all favour the Inner Harbour proposals, whilst the defects seem to be those that require expert engineering and navigational experience to appreciate and state. Furthermore, there is a significant survey of the position in the evidence tendered before us of Mr. A. E. Jull on page 43 of the official evidence. Mr. Jull said in his evidence, "That portion of the district which is responsible for 84 per cent. of the payment of any rates has since 1911, and in

spite of any recommendations of engineers to the contrary, been steadfast in their adherence to the Inner Harbour proposal." It may be added at this point that this statement by Mr. Jull was not a chance remark, but an apparently well-considered statement made at a time when Mr. Jull was practically reading his evidence from carefully prepared notes.

After Messrs. Maxwell, Williams, and Mason's report had been put in in 1909 a state of stalemate seems to have been reached until July, 1911. In that year Mr. William Ferguson, M.Inst.C.E., of Wellington, was asked to visit Napier and advise the Harbour Board in its difficulties. On the 9th July, 1911, Mr. Ferguson attended a meeting of the Board at Napier, was instructed as to the Board's object in sending for him, and he answered questions and advised the Board as to what, in his opinion, should be done. A shorthand note was taken of all that proceeded at the meeting, and the full type-written transcript is available, and appears as pages 119 to 137 in the Commission's Exhibit No. 1. The Chairman submitted two main questions to Mr. Ferguson at the beginning. They were—(1) Should the Board do dredging or other works necessary to secure data before seeking further professional advice to report on the respective merits of the two harbours? (2) If further dredging was recommended, should the Board buy or hire a dredge for that purpose?

Mr. Ferguson opened by expressing the opinion that the question of harbour-construction was not urgent, and that there was nothing to warrant the Board rushing into either works or schemes until it had all the data necessary to form a sound opinion. Mr. Ferguson states—

"I think you should wish to go easily, to wait until you are satisfied by expenditure in testing the various schemes as to which is suitable, and then, if you are still satisfied that it is wise to do it commercially, push on. At the present this is largely a matter of sentiment. You may get an Inner Harbour at a cost. It behoves you as business men to go easily—not niggardly, but to spend whatever is necessary to make the tests and then get a sound opinion and act upon it. What are the tests? The three engineers who reported, reported, I understand, that they did not approve of the Inner Harbour scheme because they felt certain that the dredging to form a channel in the open sea would be followed by a silting up, and I think they state that in heavy weather the channel would be liable to be obliterated and the port would be closed until it was reopened. This was simply a way of expressing their views, and I presume was not literally meant that a single storm would close the channel. As it is not a matter of grave urgency, I would spend a few thousand pounds in putting it to the test. It is not as if you had a huge city and the whole of its trade was in immediate risk because you are afraid of the silting of your harbours and you had to keep the trade open at all costs. You have carried on your trade successfully for many years, and I don't see why you cannot do so for some time to come. Hire or purchase a dredge and put it to work out in the open; dredge an area, certainly not less than 10 acres; carefully sound the area, not only 660 ft. square, but an equal distance all round it, and thus determine the nature of the bed of the ocean through dredging it; carefully sound again and find what variation, if any, exists in the surface of the ocean-bed after the dredging. Leave it for twelve months at least; sound it carefully again; if results are not conclusive perhaps it will be necessary to dredge again and sound again. Then you will have data which will show you whether the action of the sea is as stated by these three engineers (Hear, hear), whose opinion has to be listened to with every respect—whether it is as they say. If it silts up—and it is shown to be undoubted that it has entirely silted up—by the action of the sea, then you have your answer and it disposes of the question fairly well. If, on the other hand, it only silts up to a limited extent, you have data as to the expenditure you have to go to in annually dredging out that area."

As the result of that advice the Wellington harbour dredge "Whakarire" was chartered for three months, and on the 8th November, 1911, she arrived at Napier and started dredging that experimental patch of 10 acres to a depth of 34 ft. From that date to the 12th January, 1912, the "Whakarire" worked on that patch. In that time she dredged a patch 34 ft. deep and about 3 acres in extent—in all, that is—3 acres top superficial measurement, the hole being $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres at the bottom, the remaining $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres being accounted for by the slope of the sides. The dredgemaster's log in that period is almost one continuous record of difficulties and minor disasters. The experiment was then abandoned, as it was not possible to exceed the three-months charter, and in the opinion of the dredgemaster it would have taken at least nine months to dredge out the 10 acres. The dredgemaster in his evidence before this Commission stated that he had never before undertaken dredging in such an exposed part as the patch at Napier. Thereafter, soundings were taken by Mr. C. D. Kennedy, C.E., at the request of the Harbour Board and in accordance with Mr. Ferguson's advice. Mr. Kennedy's reports, seven in number, appear as pages 141 to 147 in the Commission's Exhibit No. 2. This experiment and the subsequent soundings provided data on most interesting and important problems in the matter of Inner Harbour construction. Firstly, there is the important evidence as to the practicability of dredging the entrance channel to the Inner Harbour in the open ocean, and this falls into two divisions—(a) Problems revealed by navigational and mechanical difficulties due to weather, seas, and ocean swell, and (b) problems revealed by the nature of the sea-bottom material as to its consistency and specific gravity and its suitability for suction dredging. Secondly, there is the evidence afforded by the soundings as to the effect of natural forces playing on the dredged patch. This includes all the evidence to be gleaned from Mr. Kennedy's soundings.

At this point again we come to a policy and course of action that we find hard to understand. The outstanding feature of this series of events at this stage is the important fact that Mr. Ferguson's excellent advice was not followed at all faithfully—in fact, what was done bears little resemblance to what Mr. Ferguson proposed. To begin with, Mr. Ferguson stipulated that a 10-acre patch at least should be dredged ("certainly not less than 10 acres," were Mr. Ferguson's words). He also said,

referring to the channel between the moles, "You should run a narrow cut through the boulder-bank—not a very wide one, but a deep one—say, to 33 ft. or 34 ft. at low water. You do not want to endanger the existing timber works, but such a cut as to show the nature of the bottom." Neither of these things was done. It is true that the reason is that the dredging-master tried to do the suggested work on the "patch" in the bay and found it physically impossible to do so in the conditions that obtained, while the navigating officer of the "Whakarire" refused to risk her in the channel between the moles. When he sought to work on the outer channel, wind, sea, and ocean swell operated to reduce the actual dredging-time to about 30 per cent. of the working-time, and to reduce seriously the efficiency of that dredging-time. As to dredging between the moles, the dredging-master in his evidence said most emphatically that he could not have dredged in the channel between the moles. The evidence shows that the dredging-master did his best, and is not to be blamed for the abandonment of the project; but these facts never seem to have been put before Messrs. Cullen and Keele when subsequently they were asked to report on the feasibility of opening and maintaining the outer channel.

Then again, Mr. Ferguson, at the beginning of his conference with the Board, was asked whether he would recommend dredging for the purpose of securing data *before the Board considered the question of seeking further professional advice* to report on the merits of the two harbours. His answer was "Yes," and he stated, "It is not a matter of grave urgency (that is, the building of your harbour). Dredge 10 acres at least; sound it again and again; leave it for *twelve months at least*, sound it carefully again; if results are not conclusive perhaps it will be necessary to dredge again and sound again."

Again the Board's policy of vacillation and intolerance of expert opinion seems to dictate its actions. Mr. Ferguson's excellent advice was given on the 9th July, 1911. The dredge "Whakarire" was chartered and began her work on the 8th November, 1911, and on the 20th December, 1911 the Board wrote to two Australian engineers, E. A. Cullen and T. W. Keele, Ms.Inst.C.E., asking them to visit Napier and advise the Board upon the best means to be adopted for carrying out certain improvements by dredging. They came, and on 14th March, 1912, they met the members of the Board at Napier, and were forthwith asked to enlarge the scope of their inquiry so as to embrace (*inter alia*) the feasibility of developing the Inner Harbour to accommodate ocean steamers *on the lines already proposed*. Mr. Jull in his evidence on page 8 described what took place in the following words: "*Mr. George Nelson's Inner Harbour scheme was also submitted to them.*" Thus less than eight months after receiving Mr. Ferguson's advice, and having in the meantime undertaken the sadly curtailed dredging experiment, the only lesson from which was that the dredge had experienced grave difficulties in trying to dredge on the site of the channel, the Board is back again at the old quest for an engineer or engineers who would approve the Inner Harbour "on lines already proposed" by Mr. George Nelson. There is no trace anywhere in the reports, correspondence, or the evidence tendered before us that Messrs. Cullen and Keele were ever informed of the experiences of the "Whakarire;" whilst the dredgemaster of the vessel, Mr. Martin, in giving evidence before us, said, "Messrs. Cullen and Keele did not in 1925 apply to me as to my dredging experiences. I saw them in 1912 and they asked me some questions about dredging in Napier. As far as I can recollect there was no very pointed reference; that was just a casual conversation." There is no evidence before us that Messrs. Cullen and Keele were ever informed of the important fact that the dredgemaster of the "Whakarire" had found the bottom of the sea on the point where he dredged to be composed of a fine sand, so light and fine that it came up in the buckets in a liquid mixture that tended to go overboard as fast as it was poured in to the dredge's hopper.

Messrs. Cullen and Keele reported in August, 1912. In brief, they reported that both harbour schemes, Inner and Breakwater, were practicable. They considered there was no proof of the sand-drift that Messrs. Maxwell, Williams, and Mason deemed to be a critical feature when considering the feasibility of cutting and maintaining the outer channel, and they concluded that it was feasible in the first place to dredge, and later, by dredging, to maintain, that channel at a depth that would allow ocean-going steamers to use it and enter the Inner Harbour thereby. Their conclusion was, "It will be seen therefrom that we consider that a satisfactory harbour can be obtained by developing the Inner Harbour on the lines indicated at the cost given in the estimates. We have also shown, as requested, what we consider should be done to complete the Outer Harbour scheme to an extent sufficient to satisfactorily meet the present and those future requirements that may reasonably be expected, and have furnished our estimates of the cost thereof."

Some correspondence then passed between the Board and Messrs. Cullen and Keele, and on the 20th November, 1912, a cable was sent to Messrs. Cullen and Keele in the following words: "*Although Harbour Board has arrived at decision upon your report, they desire, for information of ratepayers, to whom proposals must finally be submitted, that you kindly give Board your straight-out opinion as to whether the breakwater or Inner Harbour is the better proposal for Board to adopt. Kindly cable joint reply.—JULL.*" On the 25th November Messrs. Cullen and Keele replied, "We advise adoption of Inner Harbour proposal in preference to breakwater scheme.—CULLEN AND KEELE." (The italics above are ours.)

The Board adopted this recommendation and the recommended scheme, and in 1914 a Bill was submitted to Parliament seeking authority to construct the Inner Harbour, and for that purpose to borrow £300,000. That Bill was passed, becoming the Napier Harbour Board Empowering and Loan Act, 1914. Messrs. Cullen and Keele's scheme included an embankment defining and enclosing the Inner Harbour on its south and western sides. The site of this embankment was agreed upon in consultation between them and the Harbour Board and the Engineer-in-Chief for Public Works for the Dominion. An agreement was arrived at whereby the embankment which was necessary for the Inner Harbour should be so placed as to situation, and so constructed, as to serve the purposes also of a railway embankment to carry the East Coast Railway northwards from Napier, and an embankment

roadway serving road traffic on the east coast north of Napier. Any conflict of interests that became apparent was settled by compromise, the Harbour Board agreeing to a construction that would carry the railway, and the Public Works Department agreeing to the embankment being thrown farther west than they contemplated or desired so as to allow the space included to be adequate for harbour purposes.

In 1914 the Great War began and put an end to all constructive works such as were in contemplation here. However, in 1917 the Board was authorized to raise £50,000 to be used for the construction of the embankment, and the £300,000 authorized for Inner Harbour purposes was reduced by that sum, leaving £250,000 available for the balance of the harbour-construction. The ultimate cost to the Board of this embankment, including the diversion to a point outside the Inner Harbour basin of the Tutaekuri River, was £84,274. That sum was the net cost to the Board after the Public Works Department had contributed its quota.

In 1920 it was considered by the Board that the time was opportune to proceed with the harbour-construction, and again the ratepayers were approached and asked to sanction the necessary loan to go on with the Inner Harbour scheme. In accordance with the authority contained in the 1914 Act a poll was taken and the proposal was approved, 3,013 voting for it and 636 voting against it. On the authority of the 1914 Empowering Act, and with the funds made available by the loans sanctioned by the ratepayers in 1920, the Board started a series of works that might be called either "repairs and replacements" on the one hand, or a piecemeal carrying-out of the Inner Harbour construction on the other hand. The building of the embankment that defined the south and west limits of the harbour, and the diversion of the Tutaekuri River, have already been referred to. In addition to these works the Board began the deepening of the channel between the moles by dredging from a jetty built for the purpose. They rebuilt the Nelson Quay (the northern side of the Iron Pot) in a new design and in more substantial materials, and the reconstruction of the Western Quay in concrete was embarked on.

In 1924 a petition was signed by about 1,100 persons, including the Mayors of Napier, Hastings, and West Waipawa. It recited the history from the petitioners' viewpoint of the Harbour Board's activities since the propounding of Mr. George Nelson's scheme in 1909, and submitted that the tremendous financial burden imposed upon them by the unsystematized and abortive expenditure that they had alleged in their petition should be no further increased; it asked for investigation of the breakwater proposals, and prayed that a Commission of Inquiry should be set up to investigate all the matters recited in the petition. This petition was presented to Parliament, and one of the immediate results seems to have been that the Minister of Marine sent the Engineer-in-Chief of the Public Works Department, Mr. F. W. Furkert, to Napier to investigate and report. Mr. Furkert carried out his instructions and reported to the Minister on the 23rd August, 1924. His report appears in the Commission's Exhibit No. 1 as pages 193 to 200.

In his report Mr. Furkert concluded with a recommendation in favour of the Breakwater Harbour. He assumed that there would be no difficulty in cutting the proposed outer channel of the Inner Harbour and in dredging that channel and the channel between the moles to a depth of 35 ft. He arrived at the conclusion, however, that the expense of these works would be much higher than the trade of the district would justify, and, further, that the cost of upkeep would be too great to contemplate, considering the resources of the territory; and, finally, that its use would always be attended by considerable and unjustifiable risks to shipping that would be expected to use it. On the other hand, having in view the history of the breakwater, and the work it had done and the shelter it had afforded to shipping in its unfinished condition, he recommended that the Board's attention and activities should be directed to the completion of that work. This report was made available to the Harbour Board, and after considering it the Harbour Board decided to obtain a further report from Messrs. Cullen and Keele. In November, 1924, they wrote to Messrs. Cullen and Keele and invited them to visit Napier again to investigate four questions, which were—(a) The probable cost of completing the Inner Harbour to give safe accommodation for four ocean liners and other vessels that require berthage; (b) the question of erecting a half-tide wall controlled by sluice-gates or otherwise; (c) the probable cost of completing the Breakwater Harbour to give safe accommodation for four ocean liners and other vessels that require berthage; (d) the extra cost of maintenance over the present cost of each proposal. It should be noted that the half-tide wall referred to in (b) above was a distinguishing feature of Mr. George Nelson's Inner Harbour scheme.

In February, 1925, a series of borings was taken in the Inner Harbour and Breakwater Harbour. This work was done by Mr. Richard Pengelly, a man accustomed to such work, whose services were placed at the disposal of the Harbour Board by the Public Works Department. Mr. Pengelly's instructions were to bore the outer and inner harbour for the purpose of seeing what the bottom was like at both places. This work was in progress when Messrs. Cullen and Keele arrived, in April, 1925, to commence their investigations. They were supplied with Pengelly's reports, and at their request further borings were made at points indicated by them. Mr. Pengelly was engaged on the borings for about eight months. He reported the results of his work weekly to the Secretary of the Harbour Board, and his reports were all filed by the Board, and a complete copy was placed before us at the hearing: it is recorded amongst the exhibits as No. 23. The main results of his work were—(1) He disproved the alleged existence of a rocky bottom to the Breakwater Harbour; (2) he proved that the bottom of the Inner Harbour and the outer channel was composed of material that could be fairly easily dredged; (3) he disclosed the existence of a bank of boulders in the entrance channel between the moles that would make dredging somewhat difficult at that point. This bank was not extensive in area, and the difficulties of lifting it by dredging were not great. He found that it was difficult to hold and use a moored vessel in the strong current between the moles and in the tidal rip just outside.

Messrs. Cullen and Keele arrived at Napier on the 22nd April, 1925, and they submitted their report on the 23rd November of the same year. They perused Mr. Furkert's report, and they made further investigations into the various factors that had to be considered before they could report. They reaffirmed their previous conclusion that the Inner Harbour as designed by them was practicable, that there were no great difficulties in the way of cutting and maintaining the entrance channel, but they clearly stated the opinion that the cost of maintenance and dredging of the channel might be expected to be considerable. They also reported on the Breakwater Harbour, and they outlined a scheme for that harbour, with estimates of costs, and they brought the whole to a conclusion in the form of a recommendation in answer to the Board's request that they should advise the Board which of the two harbour schemes they recommended for execution. Their answer is contained in the following words:—

“We are of opinion that the adoption of the Outer Harbour scheme, with one pier, which with the Glasgow Wharf will afford accommodation for four ocean liners, is to be preferred, and recommended accordingly. Briefly, our recommendation is based on the smaller initial capital outlay required for the Outer Harbour, whilst the difference in the estimated annual maintenance for the two schemes would represent if capitalized a further large difference.”

As this recommendation is the opposite of their 1912 recommendation, it would naturally be expected that some explanation for the change in their views should be tendered, and this expectation is satisfied by the following statement which precedes the recommendation that we have quoted above. Messrs. Cullen and Keele say,—

“Shortly after submitting our report of 1912 we suggested, in reply to an inquiry from the Board, that the Inner Harbour appeared to offer a better prospect for successful execution than the Outer Harbour—an opinion based on the information then supplied to us respecting the strata in the bottom at the Outer Harbour—viz., that a large area of rock existed there which would have to be removed. The close survey of the strata which has been made this year by boring has shown that the rock formerly supposed to be there does not exist, and that the area, with the exception of a few small patches, down to 35 ft. below L.W.S. is free from rock. The strata, in the opinion of the officer in charge of the boring operations, will present no difficulty in dredging it or in driving piles into it. This survey has shown that what we considered to be a very serious objection to the successful execution of the Outer Harbour proposals does not exist in fact.”

The boring referred to in the above paragraph was carried out by Mr. Pengelly, the expert at this work who had been supplied by the Public Works Department at the request of the Harbour Board. In effect, therefore, Messrs. Cullen and Keele have twice visited Napier and made most exhaustive inquiries, and they definitely recommend the Breakwater Harbour, and explain that their previous recommendation of the Inner Harbour had been based on a misconception entertained by them respecting the strata at the bottom of the Outer Harbour; whilst in relation to the Inner Harbour they stress two disadvantages, the first being that the Inner Harbour would require the keeping in continuous commission of a large dredger, with all the expense that this involves, and the second being that the Outer Harbour was advantageous from a navigator's point of view inasmuch as it would be easier to enter during bad weather. The Board thereupon adopted Messrs. Cullen and Keele's breakwater proposal, and on the 12th January, 1926, a formal resolution recording such decision was passed and steps taken to procure the necessary legislation. In April, 1926, however, an election was held for the purpose of electing six members to represent the country districts. At this election all six members elected were declared supporters of the Inner Harbour, and they were elected by a large majority of the votes, and their accession to the Board meant that supporters of the Inner Harbour were in a majority. On the 8th June, 1926, motions were carried rescinding the previous decision to carry on with the Outer Harbour construction, and deciding instead to proceed with the construction of the Inner Harbour. Steps were taken to appoint consulting engineers and to undertake certain preliminary works that seemed to point to a continuance of the piecemeal construction of the Inner Harbour. In the meantime a Bill had been prepared for submission to Parliament intituled the Napier Harbour Board Empowering and Loan Bill. It recited the dearth of available lands to cope with the rapid expansion of the Town of Napier, and the existence of the Harbour Board's endowment lands, which, if reclaimed and levelled, would be available to meet that difficulty and would on the whole become a valuable source of revenue to the Board, and it went on to empower the Board to proceed with the filling-up, reclamation, and levelling of certain blocks of land which might be briefly described as the Awatoto Block, the 28-acre Block, the North and South Ponds, and part of the West Quay reclamation, and it gave a limited power to sell portions of some of those blocks. That Bill was remitted to a parliamentary Committee, which took evidence in the usual way. Both parties to the Inner Harbour dispute attended to give evidence, and the Committee recommended that the Bill be not proceeded with. The petitioners who had presented the petition to Parliament of 1924 again petitioned Parliament and asked that their original petition be revived. This recited the vacillations of policy that were apparent since the date of their previous petition, and they again asked for the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry. Whilst this was proceeding the expenditure upon the Inner Harbour, particularly in the form of reconstruction of the West Quay, had been continued, and questions have been raised between the Board and the Marine Department as to whether the requirements of the law as embodied in the Harbours Act have been complied with. In this connection there have been letters, telegrams, and interviews, and these gradually developed the position to which the petitions and the proceedings before the parliamentary Committee seemed inevitably to tend—namely, the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry, and this present Commission is the outcome of the position thus created.

We complete the foregoing history by showing the respective amounts expended during different periods on Inner and Outer Harbour :—

	Inner.	Outer.
First period : 1876 to adoption of Goodall's plan for breakwater in 1884. Total to end of period	£70,000	Nil.
Source of the money expended : Loan of £75,000 authorized in 1875.		
Second period : 1884 to the propounding of Mr. George Nelson's scheme in 1909. Total to end of period (breakwater constructed to stage at which it stands in 1927)	£77,730	£443,840
Sources of the money expended—		
On breakwater—loan of £225,000 authorized in 1884 and £200,000 authorized in 1892.		
On Inner Harbour—£2,730, probably balance of 1875 loan and general surplus funds.		
Third period : 1909 to the passing of the 1914 Inner Harbour Empowering and Loan Bill, 1914. Total to end of period	£89,356	£446,000 (approx.)
Sources of the money expended—		
On breakwater—Very little expenditure; probably out of general funds.		
On Inner Harbour—£12,600 expended. Probably out of any surplus cash available; in 1923 a special loan of £13,000 was found necessary and was authorized "for repayment of antecedent liability as at 31st December, 1922."		
Fourth period : 1914 to the sanctioning by ratepayers of the £300,000 loan in 1920. Total to end of period	£140,343	£447,000 (approx.)
Sources of the money expended—		
On breakwater—As in third period.		
On Inner Harbour—£50,000 expended. Loan-money authorized to be raised without a poll, by the Napier Harbour Board Empowering and Vesting Act of 1917.		
Fifth period : 1920 to 1926. Total to end of period *	£270,468	£448,707
Sources of the money expended—		
On breakwater—As in third and fourth periods.		
On Inner Harbour—£131,000. Of this £125,000 was out of loan-money authorized by the 1914 Empowering and Loan Act, sanctioned by the poll of 1920, the balance out of general cash.		

The disposal of the foregoing sum of £125,000, together with £50,000 spent on repairs and renewals, making £175,000 in all, is shown in detail in the following table. The Empowering and Loan Act of 1914 (No. 14) authorized for Inner Harbour construction a loan of £300,000 for "construction, completion, development, and improvement of the inner harbour portion of the Napier Harbour" (sections 7 and 8). Section 8: "Provided that out of this £300,000 the Board shall be entitled to expend £50,000 in and about repairing and renewing the West Quay and the Iron Pot Quay, rebuilding, reconstructing or strengthening such quays or the structures appertaining thereto respectively—including a new reclamation dredger." This sum of £50,000 is represented by the items marked † below.

	£
Of this sum of	300,000
there remains unborrowed the sum of	52,900
Borrowed	247,100
Out of this is expended—	£
1. Inner Harbour and East Coast Railway embankment	84,349
2. Rebuilding quays	†39,394
3. Deepening portion of channel between moles	4,020
4. West Quay extension	1,937
5. Cargo-shed F	†5,454
6. Cargo-shed B	†4,960
7. Plant, steel-bars, cement, &c.	14,315
8. Store shed	669
(These figures are up to 30th September, 1926.)	
9. Labourer's shed additions (share)	†193
10. Ferro-concrete piles and materials	15,047
11. Borings (share)	944
12. Port Ahuriri - West Shore ferry-landings	72
13. Engineering Expenses and cost of living bonus	3,656
14. Sundries	125
	<hr style="width: 100px; margin-left: auto; margin-right: 0;"/>
	175,135
Balance, unexpended (on fixed deposit)	£71,965

* This includes the sum £84,000, the cost to the Board of the embankment.

PART 9.—PHYSICAL FEATURES OF DISTRICT AND NATURAL FORCES ARISING THEREFROM.

PHYSICAL FEATURES.

The district to be covered by our present survey is shown on Map C in Commission's Exhibit No. 3, and is bounded thereon on the north, west, and south by a red line, and on the east by the sea. We desire, firstly, to draw attention to the coast-line from Cape Kidnappers to Whakariri, marked with the red letters "K" and "W" respectively. At both these points the coast presents a high-cliff formation. Napier lies about half-way between the two points, and the shaded portion on the map, represents Scinde Island, a high eminence turning a cliff-face to the sea. Although Scinde Island is now a promontory rather than an island, it has undoubtedly been a true island in the past.

Running inland from a point a little west of Cape Kidnappers is a line of hills, and this line can be traced south-west for roughly 20 miles. Then with a turn of short radius they wheel to the north and can be traced to Whakariri. This line presents a rampart of hills enclosing the plain that lies between them and the sea, and in some places displaying a cliff-face on their seaward sides. This range of hills is shown on Map C by an irregular broken line in brown wash. The foot of the whole rampart undoubtedly marks what was the seashore at some time in the past. It is pierced by three rivers—firstly, the Tukituki, which merges a little to the west of where Havelock North now stands; secondly, the Ngaruroro, which comes through at a point marked "Fern Hill" on the map; and, thirdly, the Tutaekuri, emerging a little to the south-east of the present site of Taradale.

RIVER ACTION.

The Tukituki River came from the south-west; it was and is a carrier of sand and shingle from an inexhaustible supply. This river drains an area of 977 square miles, its present discharge being estimated at 140,000 cubic feet per second. Heavy flooding takes place periodically, and the watershed is composed largely of old river-gravel deposits. The Ngaruroro drains an area of about 940 square miles, and its present discharge is estimated at 112,000 cubic feet per second. Heavy periodical floods also take place in this river, and, its watershed being in steep rocky country liable to slips, the river has been and is a bearer of shingle and sand. The Tutaekuri has, generally, similar characteristics to the Tukituki and Ngaruroro, but at the present time any shingle carried down by it is apt to be lodged in the Ahuriri Lagoon, silt only being carried to the Inner Harbour. In any case, whether shingle or sediment be discharged on the foreshore by this river through the Inner Harbour, its bearing as a possible supply likely to cause interference at the channel is not important, as the bulk of any shingle or sand from this source that does reach the sea must travel in a northerly direction, and therefore away from the harbour entrance. These three rivers, their water charged in varying degrees with silt, sand, and shingle, have, during probably thousands of years, gradually formed a delta, which now lies between the rampart of hills and the sea, varying in nature from the first built, and therefore the oldest-established portion, now well-grassed land at the foot of the hills, to the shingle-bank on the sea-front, which marks the latest line of formation. The process still goes on. The rivers tend continually to throw their spoil into the sea, and the sea tends to bank it up on the coast-line. This tends to form a bank of shingle enclosing a lagoon into which the river discharges, bursting its way through the enclosing boulder-bank by means of a variable channel. The lagoon becomes a siltation bed, which in the course of centuries becomes filled up higher and higher till at length the river cuts a defined channel through it, and then repeats the process of forming another bank, another lagoon, and in consequence another tract of land—formation by siltation. This process is in one aspect a fight between the land-forming habits of the rivers and land-limiting habits of the sea. Man has come on the scene, and has built a city and a harbour on the battle-line, enlisting the combatants as his allies at times, whilst at other times they mercilessly buffet and injure him and his works with a marked impartiality. The present coast-line is therefore nothing more than the present limit of the delta formed by the rivers.

ARTESIAN WATER-SUPPLY.

An interesting feature of this delta is the presence of artesian water which is freely tapped in and around Napier. The delta which we describe above overlies the old river-gravel beds, which are some 200 ft. below low water at the foreshore, and this old river-gravel bed is the source of Napier's artesian water-supply.

LITTORAL FEATURES.

At the southern end of this coast-line stands Cape Kidnappers, the western extremity of a bold line of cliffs, from which erosion by the sea provides a source of the beach shingle and sand. A few miles north is the present mouth of the Tukituki, and there any supply of shingle and sand from the cliffs is augmented. Two miles farther north again is the mouth of the Ngaruroro, which carries its share of spoil to the sea, having at times to burst its way through the shingle-banks formed by the output of the Tukituki and the banking tendency of the sea. We have, therefore, from Kidnappers to Scinde Island a distance of about eighteen miles, a beach-line where the shingle is periodically being replenished, as it started on a northerly travel by wave-action and the northerly current in the sea which flows up this coast of the Island. The Tukituki and the Ngaruroro, to reach their present mouths, have to pass through many miles of comparatively flat land formed by their own delta of shingle and sand. On their journey over this delta to the sea they tend to build up their channels above the surrounding low areas, which in turn are continually being raised during flood periods by the deposit of silt.

At Scinde Island the coast-line turns at right angles to the west for one and a quarter miles, where the waters of the Tutaekuri River finally discharge into the sea, after passing through the Ahuriri Lagoon. The sediment from this river tends to settle in the lagoon, which, whether limited by its naturally formed boulder-banks or by man-made embankments, is in reality a huge settling-basin for shingle and silt. In the last few miles of its course the Tutaekuri is very slight, and as it is continually depositing in its bed, and raising the level of that bed, it tends to silt up its own channel. Floods occur from time to time, and at these times, particularly when the outlet of the river is hindered by banked-up seas, or bars of silt and shingle, the river eventually breaks its banks in an endeavour to get away to the sea by the shortest route. This has happened often enough to justify the description of the breakaway of this river at Meanee, to the mouth of the Ngaruroro, or to the "washout" at Waitangi as a settled habit. This is simply a continuation of the natural processes that have formed the rich flats. At the present time the Tutaekuri River discharges ordinarily through the lagoon, and the Inner Harbour basin, and the entrance channel, into the bay, and, as already pointed out, its sediment, in so far as it reaches the sea, tends to be carried by tidal currents to the north-west, and therefore clear of the harbour-works. It is proposed by the Hawke's Bay Rivers Board, in order to cure the evils of the periodical floods of the Tutaekuri to the farming and residential localities in and near Napier, to divert the Tutaekuri River permanently to the sea at the mouth of the Ngaruroro. When this is done the silt and other material carried to the sea will be discharged south of the Breakwater Harbour, and will become contributory to the problem of littoral drift in relation to the harbour-entrance.

NATURAL FORCES.—OCEAN CURRENTS.

There is a bare reference in the foregoing to the ocean currents running from south to north, and sweeping round the bay from Kidnappers past Napier. The presence of this current may be taken as proved; it was so treated by all the engineers whose reports are comprised in Commission's Exhibit No. 1, and was dealt with in detail and in a most interesting form by Mr. J. P. Maxwell, M.Inst.C.E., in his evidence before the Commission (see pages 353 and 354 of the notes of evidence).

LITTORAL DRIFT.

It may be taken as proved that the ocean currents at Napier flow generally from south to north, and to some extent assist in the northerly trend of the littoral drift. The main factor, however, is the set of the heaviest prevailing seas, impinging upon the coast-line at a suitable angle. Easterly seas which strike parallel to the coast exert little, if any, effect upon the northerly trend of the littoral drift. Seas due to north and north-east winds will during the time they prevail force the littoral drift southwards; these winds at Napier do not last for long periods or cause the heaviest seas. The trend of the coast, however, between the entrance to the Tukituki River and Tangoio Point, being south-east, north, and north-north-east, is open to the heavy seas and heavy ocean ground-swell experienced on this part of the coast. These seas impinge on the beach at a most favourable angle, and are the main cause of the predominating northerly littoral drift. That the shingle travels is undeniable. On the line of beach we have described its travel is northwards from Kidnappers to Whakaari. Phenomena that can be attributed to this cause can be actually seen. Such an observation is recorded in the memoranda prepared by Mr. F. E. Saunders, Engineer of the Napier Harbour Board, in September, 1882, to accompany the conditions of competitive harbour-designs which were invited in that year. Mr. Saunders says:—

The question of travelling shingle was tested in 1875 by running out a groyne 200 ft. long at the point marked "A" on drawing No. 2A. The time occupied in erecting this groyne was about six weeks, and during this period the shingle was trapped by the groyne, and the bar remained good; but a few days after the completion of the groyne the shingle passed round the end, and the bar was again subject to the usual changes.

The arrest of this drift by the breakwater built at the Bluff at Napier is another proof of the existence of the drift. There is the further fact that the shingle where it is deposited on the beach at the mouth of the Tukituki is of large components, and might well be described as consisting of boulders; as it travels north by a kind of tacking motion up and down the beach, it is reduced in size by attrition, until by the time it reaches Whakariri it is reduced almost to sand. Its gradual reduction in size can be traced as one walks up the beach and takes note of the shingle.

SEA AND WAVE DRIFT.

It seems to be commonly accepted that sea and wave drift cause an agitation of the sea-bottom near the coast, and that when this action is more or less regular by the existence of ocean currents and a prevalent set of the waves, it offers a difficulty when it is proposed to cut a channel in the sea, exposed to these forces. In such circumstances the accepted opinion seems to be that these forces will tend to fill up and finally obliterate the channel.

TIDAL CURRENTS IN AND OUT OF LAGOONS.

Another natural force that must be taken into account as a factor in the problem of Inner Harbour construction is the tidal current generated by the alternate filling-in and discharging, by tidal action, of the harbour basin of the Ahuriri Lagoon. On the ebb tide the water races out through the channel between the moles at a speed estimated at 5 to 6 knots per hour at least. The influence of this outflow as a well-defined stream can be seen and felt quite half a mile out from the moles. The force of this stream of water issuing from the Inner Harbour has a strong scouring effect—

firstly, in the channel between the moles (where it is not paved by limestone boulders), and then on the bottom of outer channel. Such a force is relied on by harbour engineers to scour the entrance channel and keep it open. Messrs. Cullen and Keele say in their 1912 report:—

“It is a fundamental principle of marine engineering to encourage as large a body as possible of tidal water to enter an estuary and pass up to its furthest limit, thereby increasing the tidal range and gaining, with the addition of the upland water, the fullest scouring effect during the ebb tide.”

This force after issuing from the harbour-entrance must be gradually weakened and finally overcome by the inertia of the water in the bay. The general tendency of the ebb tidal stream being approximately northerly, and the general tendency of the ocean current and wave-movements being westerly, the two streams must eventually merge and result in a north-westerly flow before the effluent current loses its force altogether. To the east and north of this effluent current, outside the Inner Harbour entrance, a spit has been formed of the sand forming a part of the littoral drift which passed round the north-east end of Scinde Island before the construction of the breakwater. The balance of the two contending currents has formed this sand into a bar having a minimum depth of 19 ft. at present. Considerable changes have taken place in this spit, illustrated by the contour plans 1855 to 1927, referred to in the immediately succeeding part of this report. The effluent stream might at times be stronger, as when it is augmented by flood-waters, and in such conditions its scouring influence would extend farther out and the bar would be pushed farther out to sea. On the other hand, the effluent stream might be weakened by alterations in the width of the exit channel, or the sand-movement might be accelerated and strengthened by storms, and in such conditions the bar may be driven in closer to shore. In considering these factors it should be recorded and considered that Hawke's Bay enjoys a great preponderance of fine weather, and that storms are of rare occurrence; but, on the other hand, it is subject to a continuous and heavy ocean swell, principally from the east, north-east, and south-east.

PART 10.—THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEORIES BASED ON THOSE PHYSICAL FEATURES AND NATURAL FORCES IN RELATION TO HARBOUR-CONSTRUCTION.

THE LITTORAL DRIFT.

In all the reports and theories of the engineers on harbour matters at Napier the existence and influence of the littoral shingle-drift claims a great deal of attention. That this is so can hardly be wondered at, for it is a phenomenon that may be considered as proved, and it presents visible evidence and results, and its existence and effects are apparent to any observer. It is generally agreed that the breakwater has, since its construction, cut off the supply of shingle from the beach west and north of the Bluff. A sharp difference of opinion has, however, arisen as to whether or not there remains a sand-drift across the entrance of the Inner Harbour, constituting a serious difficulty in the task of cutting and maintaining the entrance channel.

SHINGLE DRIFT.

This drift of shingle up the coast—roughly, south to north from the Kidnappers to Scinde Island—turns with the coast-line to the west along the West Shore beach, and then again runs south to north up the Petane beach. An obvious deduction from this fact is that whenever an entrance to any harbour at or near Napier is contemplated this line of shingle-drift across the entrance to the harbour will be a factor to be dealt with, as tending to block the entrance.

In 1880, Sir John Coode in his report says:—

“The question . . . be decided . . . upon the broader principle of whether the entrance to any harbour running out from this shore, as proposed by Mr. McGregor, or otherwise, would not in the absence of backwater become so blocked by shingle after a time as to render the work practically useless. After carefully considering this feature of the case I am reluctantly compelled to express an opinion that such would be the result. The shingle travelling along the coast between the Tukituki and Napier Bluff would gather against the back of the protecting pier and turn round the curve or angle, would pass along the outer cant and be deposited in the entrance and under the lee of the westernmost works.”

In the passage just quoted there is recognition of the irresistible nature of the shingle-drift when nothing but a protecting mole or wall is erected against it. There is also, it may be noted in the words, “in the absence of backwater,” the origin of the idea that “backwash” might be a useful agency to assist to keep the work clear of shingle; but Sir John Coode does not seem to have put the ideas of the wall and backwater together as complementary features in a scheme designed to block the flow of shingle. It is not necessary to quote reports of all the other engineers on this matter of shingle-drift; it is sufficient to say that all recognize its existence and the menace it offers to harbour works.

In 1884 Mr. John Goodall, M.Inst.C.E., in his report advances a new theory which is a distinct step forward. He says:—

“When I first turned my attention to the practicability of a solid breakwater at Napier I considered it utterly impossible, for the reason that the quantity of shingle travelling appeared so great that any works begun would be overwhelmed by it before their completion. This idea was created by the prevailing and widespread opinions regarding the shingle that exists, and that have been freely used by such high authorities as Sir John Coode, Mr. Carruthers, and other engineers of note. But latterly my mind has been thoroughly disabused of such ideas. Works in opposition to the opinions of the

above-named engineers have been begun and are being carried out with vigour, and their final success is now certain. It has been found that by carrying out a mole to an obtuse angle to the set of the waves of the prevailing seas that the waves will run along the wall and will be reflected along the beach, and that when the mole is sufficiently far out that the force of the reflected waves or backwash will be great enough to drive the shingle back from the works. The shingle will then deposit along the beach behind the works instead of advancing to overwhelm them, and will in time form a valuable reclamation."

Mr. Goodall had already tested this theory at Timaru, and claimed that it had been a success there, where the problems to be met bore a close resemblance to those at Napier. His suggested scheme was adopted, and it was at his advice and to his designs that the breakwater was built. The angle at which the breakwater was thrown out from the Bluff was carefully planned so that it would meet the prevalent seas in such a way as to procure from them the maximum amount of power, in the form of backwash or reflected waves, to drive the shingle back. It may be said that the events since the breakwater was built have thoroughly justified Mr. Goodall's foresight and theory. Other engineers reporting on the work since that date have agreed that the angle at which the breakwater is thrown out is well chosen, and it may be taken as a proved fact that so far, after a test of over forty years, the breakwater has apparently stopped the flow of shingle at the point.

In 1925, in Messrs. Cullen and Keele's report, a further theory is advanced as to the effect of the breakwater, and they say:—

"The breakwater has been carried out at an obtuse angle to the set of the prevalent seas; it now forms a complete bar to the further travel of the shingle to the north. The waves strike the wall with great force, and, running along it, are reflected towards the beach. An accumulation of the water from a succession of reflected waves causes it to head up in the bight to the seawards of the commencement of the breakwater, and a strong backwash and undertow is created which, running along a well-defined channel leading around the north face of the rock shoal, as shown by the contour-lines, draws down the shingle, which is again thrown back against the breakwater by the next incoming wave, the result being that the shingle is finally reduced by attrition to mud, which no doubt is carried away in suspension by an undercurrent which is generated in all bights and indentations along the coast, and running radially from the shore seawards, and is responsible for the main contour at those places."

Here we see two ideas put forward: the first is that the action of the seas which are diverted and thrown back by the breakwater is not only to check the northward drift of the shingle, but to create a veritable grinding-mill which grinds the shingle up into mud; secondly, there is the theory that this mud is carried away in suspension by an undercurrent. The first of said theories—namely, that the breakwater converted the action of the strong seas into a shingle-grinding mill—is generally accepted, and from the appearance of the shingle at the bottom of the breakwater it may be taken as proved. The theory that the mud created by the final disintegration of the shingle is carried away to the sea was also put forward in the evidence before us by Messrs. R. W. and J. D. Holmes, and is a matter that must be considered at a later stage of this report.

SAND-DRIFT.

The theory is also put forward that there is a drift northward of sand, not at first where it can be seen, but at some distance out where it cannot be seen. Messrs. Maxwell, Williams, and Mason in their report of 1909 say:—

"Since the construction of breakwater large accumulations of shingle have taken place along the beach in front of the town and the Bluff, and during heavy southerly weather it accumulates in the corner at the root of the breakwater and is driven over the wall there. There is no trace of shingle beyond the first cant of the breakwater, and indications are that nothing but fine sand is carried past the work, although it is probable that the accumulation south of the breakwater has not yet reached its limit, and that when it does the quantity passing will be larger than at present. This drift of sand around the breakwater, but for the opposition of the ebb currents from the Inner Harbour, would spread out towards the Petane beach. It now, no doubt, assists in forming the bar which is found about 3,000 ft. outside the moles at the entrance to the Inner Harbour, and on which the sea breaks during heavy weather. This has always existed to a certain extent, but has become more pronounced since the construction of the breakwater; the ebb tide, owing to the stoppage of the shingle drift, being now able to prevent its being spread out towards the beach, while the accumulations in the neighbourhood of the entrance have entirely disappeared owing to the stoppage of the supply of shingle. We examined the bottom by dredging with the Board's grab-dredge "J. D. O." from this bank inwards, and found the bottom is composed of sand from about 2,000 ft. from the end of the eastern mole; thence inwards it is composed of shingle, increasing in size as we approach the entrance. . . . This sand-bar and sand-drift are, in our opinion, the critical features in connection with the proposal to establish an Inner Harbour suitable for the largest vessels."

In giving evidence before the Commission Mr. J. P. Maxwell again referred to this question. He said that he could see no other way of accounting for the large amount of material other than shingle which comes out of the rivers south of Napier, and he rejected the suggestion that they were carried out to sea, but maintained that they must be carried northwards in the ocean current. He referred, secondly, to the evidence afforded at Timaru by the presence of a belt of discoloured water parallel with and perhaps one-half mile out from the shore, but admitted that he had not seen the same phenomenon at Napier. He said that evidence of "making" on the Petane Beach as deposited by Mr. Furkert could be accepted as further evidence of the existence of the sand-drift.

This report was before Messrs. Cullen and Keele when they reported in 1912, and they took a contrary view. They said—

“Although we find no evidence in support of what appears to have been a commonly accepted theory of sand-drift, and do not believe that any drift exists as alleged, the surface wind during south-easterly winds not affecting the question, yet, &c.”

When reverting to the same question in their report of 1925, Messrs. Cullen and Keele stated that by personal study they could find no evidence of sand-drift either in the form of causes which would lead them to expect the drift, or of indications of its results. After referring to the scouring out of the experimental hole dredged by the “Whakarire,” they say:—

“It is impossible to reconcile the foregoing with the existence of the sand-drift along the coast, and in our opinion it offers conclusive evidence confuting the opinions expressed as to the existence of such sand-drift. . . . A sand-drift would certainly obliterate a cutting. As the small deep cut made has not been obliterated, or even altered appreciably in ten years after its side slopes fell in, the interesting theory must be given up.”

Mr. Furkert in his report in 1924 referred to the proposed entrance channel to the Inner Harbour saying:—

“The agitation of the sea-bottom whenever there was rough weather, combined with the drift of sand up the coast, which (the breakwater notwithstanding) is still in progress, would cause a continual tilling-up of this channel.”

Messrs. R. W. and J. D. Holmes in giving evidence before the Commission took the same view of the matter as did Messrs. Cullen and Keele, and on the same grounds—namely, that they could find no positive evidence of sand-drift since the erection of the breakwater; secondly, that the deepening in the bay, and especially outside the entrance moles for the Inner Harbour, was irreconcilable with the theory of sand-drift. All engineers seem to be agreed that if this sand-drift is present it will offer a barrier to the maintenance of an entrance channel of much the same kind as would be offered by a travel of shingle.

OUR CONCLUSIONS ON THE QUESTION OF SAND-DRIFT.

We have had the benefit of being able to study and consider all these reports and also evidence bearing on this point that has not previously been assembled and put forward. This takes the form of certain soundings and contour maps covering a period of from 1855 to date.

Mr. Furkert, in giving evidence, produced as Exhibit No. 111 five plans which he had prepared showing the contours of the sandspit in the bay as they were in the years 1855, 1882, 1895, 1906, and 1927 respectively. We have had photographic reproductions of this exhibit prepared, and we show them as plans No. D1855 to D1927 in Commission's Exhibit No. 3. If these are examined it will be seen that drawn at right angles across the contour-lines is the centre-line of the proposed entrance channel to the Inner Harbour. If the 1855 map be examined it will be seen that at that date the 30 ft., 27 ft., 24 ft., and 22 ft. contours extended up to and across the centre-line to the east of the same. The 22 ft. contour extended to a distance of about 33 ft. to the east of this centre-line. The areas included in these contour-lines are shown in red hatching on plan D1855. If attention now be given to the map for the year 1882 (an interval of twenty-seven years) it will be noted that the 30 ft. and 27 ft. contours no longer exist on the centre-line, and that even the 24 ft. contour has been pushed over and is wholly on the western side of this line, whilst the 22 ft. contour, although still generally on the east side of the line, has a slight protrusion to the west, but has its maximum distance on that side of the centre-line reduced from 330 ft. to about 165 ft. On the 1855 map the width of the 22 ft. contour at the point where the centre-line cuts across it was 990 ft., but in 1882 the width is reduced to 660 ft. In the year 1927, after an interval of forty-five years since 1882, we find that the 22 ft., 24 ft., 27 ft., and 30 ft. contours have moved easterly, and a new 32 ft. contour, which did not even exist in 1855, has also appeared on the east of the centre-line, the distances to the east being respectively 22 ft., 785 ft.; 24 ft., 724 ft.; 27 ft., 620 ft.; 30 ft., 458 ft.; and 32 ft., 333 ft. It will be noticed that the new 32 ft. contour is now approximately where the 22 ft. contour was in 1855; the length along the centre-line between the south and north limits of the 22 ft. contour is now 2,722 ft. as against 990 ft. in 1855 or 660 ft. in 1882.

It will also be noticed that the north-west tongue of the spit, as indicated by the 22 ft. contour in 1855, was some 330 ft. west of the centre-line, and was in the year 1882 some 1,800 ft. west of same, and that in the year 1927 is only 1,155 ft. west of the centre-line. The elongation of this spit to the west during the period 1855-82, and the other alterations that we have described above were, no doubt, largely due to the construction of the eastern and western moles at the Inner Harbour entrance during 1876-78. To assist ourselves and readers of this report to a clear understanding of what has taken place on this spit, we have plotted cross-sections of the spit and prepared a comparative plan of these cross-sections at the three dates involved—viz., 1855, 1882, and 1927. In considering these it must be remembered that the breakwater was commenced in the year 1885. A comparison of these cross-sections shows that the area of this sandspit was very greatly increased during the period 1855-82. A plan of these cross-sections is included in Commission's Exhibit No. 3, and is marked “Plan No. E.” On each of the plans of the spit is shown the line of the centre of the entrance channel, and this is the basic line of our cross-sections. Proceeding in an easterly direction from this base-line, we have laid cross-sectional lines at intervals of 5 chains, and these are numbered from 1 to 12. Proceeding in a westerly direction from the base-line we have also laid cross-sectional lines at a distance of 5 chains apart, and they are numbered 01 to 04, inclusive.

Now, if the section between the base-line and line No. 01, 5 chains west of the centre-line, be examined, it will be seen that the material deposited between 1855 and 1882 had been almost wholly removed by 1927; not only so, but some of the original 1855 bottom which had not been covered by the 1855-82 deposits is also removed. The following three sections covering the tract within lines

02, 03, and 04 proceeding westward show that the material deposited between 1855 and 1882 had been removed, and that a considerable area of deep water which existed in 1855 on the outer end of these sections had shoaled up from 6 ft. to 8 ft.

We now give our attention to the sectional lines travelling eastwards from the centre-line. Taking first the section between the centre-line and line No. 1, we note that a portion of the material deposited between 1855 and 1882 had been removed, and also that a very large area of the 1855 bottom had been deepened by about 11 ft. This deepening gradually worked eastwards for a distance of 65 chains from the centre-line. The material which had been deposited in the period 1855-82 had been removed, but otherwise there is little difference between the contours of 1855, 1882, and 1927. The foregoing figures and deductions refer to the sea-bottom from high-water mark out to the 24 ft. contour. Further, we find that between the 24 ft. contour and 36 ft. contour there has been a general deepening since 1906 to an extent of from 3 in. to 18 in., the chief exception to this being an area of 35 chains in width immediately north of the spit and in direct line with the Inner Harbour entrance. It is important to note that in the first period, 1855 to 1882, the material piled up between the centre-line and cross-sectional line 04 was much more than could be supplied by the material cut away from the area covered by the cross-sectional lines to the east of the centre-line. The inference seems irresistible that the surplus material was supplied by the littoral drift round the Bluff. The absence of any such accretion or piling-up since 1882 points, in our opinion, with equal clearness to the fact that the breakwater has cut off this source of supply.

Giving attention to the sea-bottom at the breakwater, we find that siltation has taken place on the eastern or seaward side to a width of some 12 chains, and on the western or sheltered side to a width of about 20 chains; the depth of siltation varying from nothing on the western edge to 10 ft. close under the breakwater. The soundings taken in 1906 and 1927 shown on the map of comparative soundings prepared by Messrs. Holmes and Son—Commission's Exhibit No. 3, Plan J—indicate a general deepening between the western edge of the sea-bottom of the shoal just referred to upon the sheltered side of the breakwater and the entrance to the Inner Harbour. In our opinion this also is evidence that the volume of the littoral drift indicated by the accretion which took place between 1855 and 1882 (shown in the comparative contours we have been describing) does not now exist. It should be noted also that the comparative contours of 1855, 1882, and 1927 show a general erosion between the breakwater shoaling and the eastern side of the entrance to the inner channel. Taking into account all the foregoing facts, we are of opinion that the present shoaling of the 1855 deep areas to the west of the Inner Harbour entrance and the shoaling to the north of the sandspit are not due to the drift of shingle or sand travelling around the breakwater, but are due to the erosion of the sea-bottom which has been taking place since 1882 between the breakwater and the Inner Harbour entrance, and possibly, to some extent, by detritus from the flood-waters of the Tutaekuri River. We would, however, point out that at some time in the future the drift around the breakwater may increase in volume, and this is a possibility that should not be lost sight of. This possibility demands that reasonable precautions should be taken when carrying out any proposed harbour improvements to allow for and mitigate its detrimental effects as far as possible.

Mr. Furkert in his evidence testified to accretion taking place at the present time along the Petane beach, and the cross-sectional plans put in by him afford evidence of this accretion. This is somewhat difficult to account for unless it is presumed that the gravel which is held up on the eastern side of the breakwater has been forced to continue its northerly travel in deep water and finally arrives on the Petane beach after a somewhat devious course. Mr. Furkert points out that a similar phenomenon actually takes place in Wellington across the harbour-entrance, and it is also well established that gravel is known to travel in deep water in the English Channel.

There is, however, another explanation, which we consider is most probably the correct one. It requires us to note, firstly, that the foreshore immediately west of the Inner Harbour entrance and for a short distance to the north is protected by the breakwater and the sandspit from heavy south-east and easterly seas, which have not the opportunity of impinging on the beach with the same effect as north-easterly seas. We then note further that this same portion of the foreshore is fully exposed to these north-easterly seas, the result being that the gravel-bank which existed in 1883 on the west side of the harbour-entrance has been cut out and washed in a south and easterly direction until it has met the ebb tidal currents issuing from the Inner Harbour. The net result of these conflicting forces is that the gravel and sand have been finally carried in a north-westerly direction, until they have ultimately been thrown on to the Petane beach, where it is no longer protected by the breakwater and sandspit, and where it has a less favourable trend for north-easterly seas to act upon. To preserve spit, town, and the Inner Harbour entrance, steps should be taken to protect this foreshore where it is now being denuded.

The original formation of the sandspit of 1855-82 was no doubt due to the selective effect of the ebb tide on the drift of sand and gravel as it passed from east to west of the Inner Harbour entrance. These tidal waters as they maintain velocity would hold the lighter material in solution and transport it, gradually precipitating it as the water lost its velocity, and thus forming the sandspit. We have already described the travel of shingle and gravel over the thirty miles of beach from Kidnappers to Whakaari, and the gradual reduction of the shingle in size, as the result of attrition, so by the time Whakaari is reached the material consists almost entirely of gravel the size of peas. The grinding that the gravel is subjected to along the foreshore reduces a large quantity of it to fine mud, which the tidal action and littoral current transport seaward, the discoloured water due to this cause being quite apparent for at least one mile from the foreshore.

We find no evidence of the travel of this mud across the Inner Harbour entrance, and are therefore of opinion that there is no reason to fear siltation from this source in connection with the harbour-works. The grinding process under present conditions results, firstly, in a considerable reduction in the possible volume of gravel and sand to be dealt with; secondly, the sea disposal of the resultant mud.

PART 11.—A BRIEF GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE BREAKWATER HARBOUR.

(a) AS TO LOCALITY.

The Breakwater Harbour is situated at the foot of a rocky eminence known as the Bluff, about a mile, via the Marine Parade, from the business centre of Napier. The coast, which in general is running nearly north-and-south, makes at this point a nearly rectangular turn to the west, and the breakwater runs out into the sea from the point of the angle. The exact position in relation to the town and the Inner Harbour can be seen by reference to the plan appearing as A in Commission's Exhibit No. 3, where the breakwater is shown at the bottom right-hand corner of the plan.

(b) AS TO CONSTRUCTIONAL DETAILS.

The breakwater itself is to-day 2,830 ft. in length, and it is built to a height of 6 ft. above high water. It is built on a rubble foundation of concrete blocks (12 ft. by 6 ft. by 6 ft.) up to a height of 2 ft. above low water, and this is capped by a monolithic block of concrete made *in situ*. The base was originally protected from scour on weather side by an apron of large rubble blocks thrown in pell-mell; later, further protection was afforded by throwing in large concrete blocks deposited pell-mell. The breakwater is first thrown out from the shore in a north-easterly direction at an angle of 120° to the set of the prevalent south-east seas. This is designed to divert or reflect the seas, causing them to run in along this first cant of the breakwater and create a backwash that will drive the shingle back from the works and retard the shingle travelling from south of the breakwater. From seaward end of this first cant the breakwater turns in a more northerly direction and again in a north-westerly direction to enclose a basin and give protection from north-easterly seas. Inside this breakwater there is built a wharf, known as the Glasgow Wharf, about 580 ft. in length, which is used by vessels drawing up to 26 ft. There is also a breastwork wharf available for vessels drawing up to 18 ft. A railway-track serves both wharves, but the wharves have no vehicular road and no goods-sheds. A lithographic plan prepared to illustrate Mr. Furkert's 1924 report appears as Map B in Commission's Exhibit No. 3. On this map the existing works are outlined in red; the rest of the works sketched thereon indicate suggested future extensions. The photograph, Plan K, Commission's Exhibit No. 3, shows the present state of the breakwater. We wish to state that this photograph was chosen from a number of existing photographs as being the best and clearest of those submitted to us of the breakwater itself. The amount of shipping at the wharves on the occasion at which this was taken must, according to the evidence tendered to us, be considered as quite exceptional, and is probably the reason why this particular photograph was taken. We therefore, with this explanation, present it here as a good photograph of the breakwater and wharves.

(c) AS IN RELATION TO EXISTING TRANSPORT FACILITIES AND TERMINI.

In the term "existing transport facilities" we would include roads, railways, and such buildings as warehouses, storehouses, and goods-sheds which have been erected as adjuncts to the system of cargo collection and distribution. The Breakwater Harbour is somewhat at a disadvantage in relation to existing transport facilities, particularly railway facilities. On the Plan A of Commission's Exhibit No. 3 we show, coloured in brown, the roads that completely encircle that part of the Napier Borough known as Scinde Island, which might now be well described as a rocky promontory from 200 ft. to 300 ft. high. From the Breakwater wharf, running nearly south along the sea-front, is the Marine Parade, which supplies the shortest route from the breakwater to the town, and also from and to Hastings and the country south of Napier. From the breakwater, running nearly in a westerly direction, is a road that runs parallel with the Harbour Board's railway and then turns in a south-westerly direction along the south-west face of Scinde Island. On the seaward side of this road, about 35 chains from the root of the breakwater, will be seen the Harbour Board's goods-shed known as the E shed. At the root of the breakwater there is at present practically no land available, and the road which skirts the angle of Scinde Island is at this point close up to the rocky sides of the Bluff, and any land required between, say, the junction of Byron Street and Marine Parade to the south of the breakwater and the point where the Harbour Board's railway begins to leave the sea front to the west of the breakwater will have to be made by reclamation. On the Plan A, Commission's Exhibit No. 3, a little to the south of the Iron Pot, on part of the Inner Harbour, will be seen the terminus of the Government railways. It is marked "Spit Railway-station." The Harbour Board's railway runs from there to the breakwater, and it is over this railway that goods arriving by rail are transported to the breakwater, a distance of about a mile. The Board's railway is of the same gauge as the State railway, so that the Government rolling-stock can be used when it is desired or possible to avoid handling goods by transshipping them into the Board's trucks. The small strip of land bounded on the south by Hardinge Road, on the west by the eastern mole of the Inner Harbour entrance, and on the north by the sea-front, contains an area which has been set apart as the dangerous-goods area, and on this are erected oil-stores. (This area is shown lightly shaded in red on Plan A, Commission's Exhibit No. 3.) Various warehouses, general stores, and wool-stores are erected either facing or contiguous to the West Quay, which is shown on Plan A as a part of the Inner Harbour. The offices of the Harbour Board and the Port offices of the shipping companies are all situated close to the various quays that comprise the Inner Harbour.

The following table shows the distances from various points to the Breakwater Harbour:—

To Breakwater Harbour—	Approximate Feet.
Per road from Napier Railway-station, via Marine Parade, to Glasgow Wharf	14,300
Per railway from Napier Railway-station to E cargo-shed	17,300
Per railway from Napier Railway-station to Glasgow Wharf	19,800

(NOTE.—Shorter road route to Hastings and country south of Napier.)

PART 11 (*continued*).—A BRIEF GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE INNER HARBOUR.

(a) AS TO LOCALITY.

The Inner Harbour is situated to the west of Scinde Island. Its entrance is shown on Plan A in Commission's Exhibit No. 3 already referred to. The proposed entrance channel, which is shown by stippling running out into the sea, leads the eye to the entrance moles, which may be identified by the cross-sectional line marked "B-B" which crosses it. The existing moles are shown as sketched by a thin continuous line. The heavy broken lines show the limits of the proposed channel after the suggested widening.

(b) AS TO CONSTRUCTIONAL DETAILS.

On entering the Inner Harbour via this channel a bay on the left-hand side marked "Iron Pot" is noted. This is at present a most useful harbour for small craft. On its northern side there is the newly reconstructed Nelson Quay. At its eastern or landward end there are concrete steps and a launch-landing. On the southern side is the Jull Quay. Proceeding up the harbour from the mouth of the Iron Pot is to be observed the West Quay, where at present extensive reconstruction work is going on, the Quay being substantially rebuilt in concrete. This quay to the point indicated by the head of the bridge which runs across to the West Shore (it is marked "Bridge to be demolished") has a further 1,400 ft. of quay suitable for small vessels drawing up to 14 ft. or 15 ft. This is capable of being dredged to a depth of about 20 ft. At the present time the small bridge, to which attention has been called is the shortest and most convenient line of communication with the borough for residents on the West Shore, but it is in a bad state of repair, as is only natural seeing that the proposed Inner Harbour works contemplate the removal of this bridge.

The stippled channel to which we have already referred will be seen running into the Inner Harbour and skirting the proposed West Quay extension which forms part of the proposed Inner Harbour works as shown on the plan. Proceeding in a southerly direction on this line we come at 6,000 ft. from the Iron Pot to the embankment which forms the southern and western boundaries of the proposed Inner Harbour, running from a westerly to a northerly direction in a broad sweep. At a point just after this embankment has taken its northerly direction will be seen in a heavy black line the position of the heavy concrete railway-bridge, designed to allow the influx and efflux of tidal waters to the Ahuriri Lagoon. On the western side of the harbour and round the sweep of this embankment will be seen in broken outlines the suggested potentialities of the Inner Harbour in the matter of wharf-construction. We have already called attention to the road coloured brown which encircles Scinde Island. The land bounded by that road on one side and the sea-front of the Inner Harbour works on the other side is quite flat, and it will be noted that there are three areas, marked respectively "North Pond," "South Pond," and "West Quay Reclamation," which the Harbour Board intends to reclaim, a work which must be considered as naturally and economically incidental to any scheme of Inner Harbour construction.

In general terms, therefore, the Inner Harbour as now used and the proposed completed Inner Harbour can be described as an enclosed portion of the Ahuriri Lagoon connected with the sea by a protected channel. This is a tidal lagoon. The lagoon area at present comprises about 7,900 acres, and the openings to the bridge in the embankment to which we have already called attention are designedly left to preserve the scouring effect afforded by the filling and emptying of this lagoon twice daily by the tides. The entrance channel to the Inner Harbour has a choking effect on the tides, so that the tides in the Inner Harbour basin lag behind the tides in the outer bay. The bridge opening referred to also has a choking effect, so that the tides in the Ahuriri Lagoon proper lag behind the tides in the Inner Harbour basin. This is a phenomenon that will be dealt with more in detail in a later portion of this report, but it may be stated now by way of brief explanation that the tide continues to run into the Inner Harbour through the entrance channel for an hour and a half after high tide has occurred in the bay. It is then that slack water occurs at the entrance to the Inner Harbour, for it is only when the tide in the bay has fallen for an hour and a half after high tide that the sea-levels in the bay and in the Inner Harbour coincide. This period of slack water lasts about ten to twenty minutes. During the flood tide and the ebb tide, between these periods of slack water there is a very strong current between the moles which mark the entrance channel, reaching as high as 5 or 6 knots per hour. The current thus generated by the difference in the levels and directed by the moles to the entrance channel is felt for nearly a mile out in the bay, and affords a valuable scouring agency for keeping open the channel between the moles and any proposed entrance channel to the harbour. This phenomenon will also be referred to in greater detail at a later stage of this report.

The wharves surrounding the Iron Pot are in good condition, and, as will be seen by the Plan A, are served to some extent by railway facilities. At present wharves at the West Quay are undergoing reconstruction in a permanent form.

(c) AS IN RELATION TO EXISTING TRANSPORT FACILITIES AND TERMINI.

Here again in the term "transport facilities" we include not only roads and railways, but buildings which are necessary adjuncts to traffic problems. The Inner Harbour is well placed in relation to existing cargo-sheds, stores, and railway. The road coloured brown skirting Scinde Island has already been referred to, and it shows as an arterial route between the Inner Harbour loading and unloading points and the Town of Napier. The position of the Spit Railway-station, the terminus of the Government railway at this point, has also been indicated, and it can be seen on Plan A near the Iron Pot. The railway connections between the West Quay and the Iron Pot can also be seen on the plan. The block of land shown between parallel lines of the Government railway and the West

Quay is occupied by wool and general stores and warehouses. It is from the West Quay that lighters are despatched with wool, meat, and general cargo to big steamers in the roadstead, and imports that require sorting are discharged at a shed adjacent to the Iron Pot. There is a great dearth of land in proximity of the Inner Harbour works, and such land as there is commands high prices as freehold, and high rentals as Harbour Board leaseholds. This position will be considerably relieved when the reclamation of the areas already referred to in this connection is accomplished. The arterial road to the city is in the main wider and therefore more commodious than the Marine Parade, which connects the Breakwater Harbour with the town, but, on the other hand, it carries, in parts, tramway traffic in competition with vehicular traffic. Goods and other traffic from Gisborne, Wairoa, and intervening districts, and all country north of Napier, would approach the town over the East Coast Road which shares the embankment with the railway. All vehicles using this road as an approach to Napier therefore enter at a point much nearer to the Inner Harbour and its facilities than they do to the Breakwater Harbour. The same comment is equally applicable to vehicles coming into the town on the Taradale Road.

It should perhaps be mentioned that the freezing-works shown on Plan A on the western side of the entrance channel to the Inner Harbour are now closed down, and the buildings, which are now owned by the Harbour Board, are to be demolished.

The following table shows the distances from various points to the Inner Harbour :—

To Inner Harbour—	Approximate Fect.
Per road from Napier Railway-station to West Quay 10,500
Per road from Napier Railway-station to south of Iron Pot 11,300
Per road from Napier Railway-station to north of Iron Pot 11,700
Per road from Napier Railway-station to shed at Iron Pot 12,200
Per railway from Napier station to Government Railway terminus at Iron Pot 11,000

THE ROADSTEAD HARBOUR.

The roadstead in which overseas vessels anchor to load and discharge their cargoes from a fleet of lighters may well be considered as an adjunct of the Inner Harbour as at present worked. The overseas vessels anchor in about 6 fathoms of water a little more than a mile out from the entrance to the Inner Harbour, and there they are served by a fleet of lighters, the property of Richardson and Co., Ltd., shipowners. These lighters carry cargo to and from the wharves of the Inner Harbour, and when not in use are berthed in the Inner Harbour.

One point on which practically all witnesses competent to speak on the matter were in agreement was that Hawke's Bay enjoys quite a large proportion of fine weather, and this is reflected in the comparative ease with which the working of vessels is carried out in the roadstead. Mr. McLeay, the managing director for Richardson and Co. deposed that the principal cause of delay in the roadstead was rain.

Some evidence was given which took the form of complaints against the lightering equipment and service, but we are of opinion that nothing serious in this direction can be considered proved. The work is seasonal, and it occasionally happens in the height of the wool season that there is a sudden concentration of overseas ships at Napier, and that the lightering fleet is not sufficient to give them all at one time the utmost despatch that they might require. Another complaint was against the age and alleged inefficiency of some of the lighters; but we think that not much ground for serious complaint exists. Mr. McLeay, the manager for Richardson and Co., Ltd., deposed—and we see no reason for not accepting his evidence—that the lighterage comprises not more than one-seventh of his company's business, and that it is not a lucrative portion of that business; it may be that in these circumstances the owners of the lighters are not too ready to scrap old plant and replace the units with newer and up-to-date vessels.

As was pointed out elsewhere, the chief exports from the port are wool and frozen meat, and practically the whole of this is loaded in the roadstead by means of the lighters. This service costs the exporting and importing interests the sum of about £30,000 per annum, a total which works out at an average cost of about 10s. per ton. Mr. McLeay's evidence was that his firm's fleet of lighters could work four vessels at once in the roadstead and give them reasonable despatch; under these circumstances three ships could work two hatches, while the remainder could work one hatch only. Typical vessels using the roadstead were anchored there during our sittings—viz., the s.s. "Tamaroa," 12,350 gross tons, which when deeply laden draws 33 ft., and the s.s. "Port Melbourne," 12,450 tons dead weight, drawing 30 ft. 3 in. As a general rule, however, Napier is not a final port of call, and overseas ships have to visit other New Zealand ports before departing for England, so that vessels of the class we mention above would seldom draw more than 25 ft. to 26 ft. when leaving Napier.

It was alleged by more than one witness that many vessels berth in the roadstead which could have been berthed in the Breakwater Harbour, but that they are prevented by the owners and the local agents from berthing at the Glasgow Wharf in the Breakwater Harbour. We were asked to draw the inference that this policy was adopted in some cases because the owners and agents were interested in the lightering company. We must find on the evidence tendered that this allegation is not proved. It was also alleged that shipping companies load the freight or goods consigned to Napier with an extra charge over and above freight, to cover discharge in the roadstead, and that this additional charge is levied in some cases where the ship might well and conveniently have been accommodated at the Glasgow Wharf in the Breakwater Harbour, and even in some cases where the discharging vessel has actually berthed at the Glasgow Wharf. This complaint relates chiefly to

vessels arriving from American ports. The evidence satisfied us that a legitimate grievance is disclosed here, but, seeing that the charges are levied and the policy which dictates the point at which the cargo is discharged is fixed by the owners of the vessels, we can make no finding as to the precise reasons or causes underlying this extra charge. We are satisfied, however, that there are influences which seem to operate to the discouragement of the use of the Breakwater Harbour even by steamers which, judging by their weight and draught, could conveniently berth in the Breakwater Harbour. One reason seems to be that the owners of the overseas vessels apparently consider that their vessels are safer working in the roadstead than they would be if berthed at the Glasgow Wharf, whilst the breakwater is in its present unfinished condition. In view of this unfinished condition of the breakwater it can hardly be suggested that this is an unreasonable attitude for owners to adopt.

The ultimate object of harbour-construction at Napier is clearly the abolition of lightering. The evidence satisfies us that nothing less than four overseas berths of sufficient size and with sufficient depth of water will be sufficient to eliminate lightering, even though there might be in the aggregate very few days in the year when all these berths would be required at once. The position is that when these big steamers do come to Napier they will require to be dealt with promptly and will not brook being kept waiting for a berth. Therefore the provision of only two overseas berths would be inadequate and unsatisfactory, both to shipowners and to exporters, and would necessitate the maintenance of lighters as a standby whenever more than two oversea boats were ready to load cargo.

PART 12.—PRACTICABILITY OF HARBOUR-CONSTRUCTION.

(a) AT INNER HARBOUR, OR (b) AT THE BREAKWATER.

We now approach the first of the questions set out on our order of reference. We are asked to inquire into and report whether, in view of reports already furnished and of our investigations, it is *practicable to construct a harbour* suitable for the requirements of the Napier Harbour Rating District as at present constituted, (a) at the Inner Harbour, or (b) at the breakwater. We are treating this question as an inquiry into the physical practicability of extending existing harbours, and we are answering it accordingly.

We view the words "suitable for the requirements of the Napier Harbour Rating District as at present constituted" as a qualification which directs our attention to the geographical features and position of the harbour district, and its potential as well as its present resources and requirements. In answering the question on this basis we *leave out of account* all financial and economic factors that must be weighed when we are answering the third question on our order of reference—viz., whether the expenditure of the money necessary to construct such a harbour can be justified from the financial and economic aspect. *We ask that all who read this report will bear this qualification in mind when reading the present answer.* Furthermore, we wish to say here, briefly, that before answering this question we have studied closely all the factors that, in our opinion, indicate "the requirements of the Napier Harbour Rating District as at present constituted." These factors will be marshalled and their bearing on the harbour problem discussed in our answers to the subsequent questions on the order of reference.

(a) INNER HARBOUR.

We answer Your Excellency's question in the affirmative. We say, Yes, it is practicable to construct a harbour suitable for the requirements of the Napier Harbour Rating District as at present constituted, at the Inner Harbour. For the present purpose we look upon the Inner Harbour as divided into three parts. Firstly, there is the Inner Basin or Harbour itself, with its adjunct of wharves, embankments, training-walls, and other necessary appurtenances. The evidence satisfies us that by dredging the basin to a sufficient depth, by building the necessary wharves, embankments, and training-walls, and providing the required shore facilities, this portion of the harbour is quite practicable. None of the portions of the work thus described offer any great engineering or practical difficulties.

The second part of the Inner Harbour as a whole is the entrance channel between moles from the Iron Pot to the entrance into the bay. Such an entrance exists to-day, and it is quite practicable to widen it and deepen it as has been suggested, and neither of these works offers any great engineering or practical difficulties, and when done this channel would be a useful and adequate adjunct to the inner basin portion of the harbour.

The third part of this harbour as a whole is the outer channel cut from a point where the channel between the moles ends to a point out at sea where there is sufficient depth of water for vessels desiring to enter the channel. *A necessary adjunct to this channel, in our opinion, would be proper protective works such as are provided in other ports of the world where similar channels are used. These protective works must be sufficient to protect shipping passing through the channel, and to protect the channel itself from the natural forces which operate on an unprotected channel in an open sea-bed.* The provision of such protective works and the dredging and maintenance of such a protected channel, whilst comparatively costly when included in a provincial port, offer, in our opinion, no great engineering or practical difficulties, and this outer channel could be provided so that it would be an adequate and safe entrance to the other parts of the Inner Harbour as a whole.

Our opinion as to the practicability of this harbour accords with that of practically all the experts who have reported, and with the experience of ports built in similar or analogous situations and circumstances. It will be noted that those engineers who in the various reports have condemned the specific Inner Harbour or channel proposals submitted to them have agreed that a satisfactory Inner Harbour for overseas vessels, including an entrance channel, could "at a cost" be built on the site of the present Inner Harbour at Napier.

(b) BREAKWATER HARBOUR.

Again we answer Your Excellency's question in the affirmative. The evidence that we have heard satisfies us that it is practicable to construct a harbour suitable for the requirements of the Napier Harbour Rating District, as at present constituted, at the breakwater. Such a harbour as designed by Mr. Goodall consists of a basin at the foot of the north-western side of Scinde Island, enclosing a harbour of about 105 to 117 acres. The existing breakwater as shown on the lithographed Plan B of Commission's Exhibit No. 3, carried out to the Auckland Rock, which is shown on that plan, forms one of the enclosing arms of the harbour, whilst the mole outlined in green on the said Plan B, forms the other arm.

The other features of the harbour, if it is to be adequate, must be the presence of a swinging-basin sufficient for such overseas vessels as are likely to use the port, wharf and shed accommodation, and sufficient ground made by reclamation to accommodate such shore sheds and other buildings as are necessary to the working of the harbour. There must also be proper transport facilities in the way of access by road and rail for vehicular and railway waggons. There must be an entrance on a sailing-course on a line where sufficient depth can be given and maintained. We are quite satisfied that all these features are attainable, and that the attainment of none of them offers any great engineering or practical difficulty, and that such a harbour being provided would be a reasonably commodious, safe, and convenient harbour for the shipping of the port.

PART 13.—WHICH HARBOUR IS RECOMMENDED.

We now approach the second of the questions set out in Your Excellency's order of reference—viz., "If it is practicable to construct a suitable harbour at (a) the Inner Harbour, or at (b) the breakwater, which of such schemes would you recommend, as providing the best and most suitable harbour from an engineering, navigational, and economic point of view?"

We define the word "suitable" in this question as meaning a harbour (1) capable of admitting and harbouring in reasonable safety modern overseas liners drawing up to 26 ft., and (2) reasonably capable of being developed to accommodate vessels of greater draught when necessary.

Our answer to this question is that, taking into account the engineering, navigational, and economic factors that enter into the problem, weighing each in relation to the whole problem and to the other factors, we recommend the breakwater as providing the best and most suitable harbour. We propose now to marshal the facts and deductions that have led us to that decision, and we begin by pointing out that our conclusion accords with that of every engineer with experience of harbour-construction to whom the above question has been submitted.

When Mr. A. E. Jull, the present Chairman of the Napier Harbour Board, was giving evidence before us he was asked by Mr. Lusk, "How many engineers have reported in favour of a deep-water Inner Harbour?" Mr. Jull answered, "Six—Sir John Coode, Mr. James Abernethy, Sir John Hawkshaw, Mr. W. Culcheth, Messrs. Cullen and Keele, also Messrs. Bell and Scott." (For this question and answer see page 7, Notes of Evidence.)

There is no doubt that Mr. Jull, the Chairman of the Harbour Board, is the chief protagonist of the Inner Harbour scheme, and we therefore assume that the foregoing answer comprises the most inclusive list of engineers allegedly in favour of a deep-water Inner Harbour scheme that could be cited. We therefore propose to examine the claim that these engineers have reported in favour of a deep water Inner Harbour.

Sir John Coode: Report is dated 1880, described in opening paragraph as "Report on the works I should recommend in order to provide a suitable harbour for the port of Napier."

Recommendations: Inner Harbour; channel between piers to be deepened so as to have 10 ft. at low water; later, channel to be further improved by dredging to at least 12 ft. below L.W.S.T. At the time this report was written and this harbour planned, ocean liners of the dimensions and draught of those that now call at Napier had not even been thought of.

Mr. James Abernethy, Sir John Hawkshaw, Mr. W. Culcheth: We group these three engineers together. The first-named two were the English judges who awarded the Harbour Board's prize of £500 to the third named (Mr. W. Culcheth) for his report on harbour-construction at Napier. None of these gentlemen ever visited Napier. The information in the Culcheth report, and on which the judges made their award, is contained in a printed pamphlet which we have included in Commission's Exhibit No. 2, pages 1 to 5. It will be seen that this memorandum gives particulars of existing Inner Harbour works, and works in hand and proposed, and that it was accompanied by drawings of Port Ahuriri roadstead and harbour, and details of moles; also sections of borings in the inner lagoon. There is no mention or suggestion of the breakwater proposed in 1875 by Mr. McGregor. Mr. Culcheth, who, we repeat, never saw Napier, made a report, dated July, 1883, which he described as "a scheme for the improvement of the harbour." He states as one of the requirements, "To maintain depth of 20 ft. at low water in the channel between the moles and in the approaches thereto."

We include in Commission's Exhibit No. 3, as Plan F, a plan of comparative soundings from West Quay to the outer bar of the Inner Harbour. The black line at the top represents L.W.S.T.; the broken yellow line below it represents the depth of 12 ft., the maximum to which Sir John Coode proposed to dredge; the broken blue line next below that represents the 20 ft. depth to which Mr. Culcheth proposed to dredge; whilst the bottom line, a broken brown line, represents the 34 ft. depth to which Messrs. Cullen and Keele proposed to dredge to provide a channel for modern liners. The irregular lines in the corresponding respective colours represent the sea-bottom at various dates—*e.g.*, the yellow in 1878, when Sir John Coode reported; the blue in 1882, when Mr. Culcheth

reported ; whilst the red irregular line indicates the sea-bottom in 1927. All of these are taken on the line of the channel entrance, including the channel between the moles. A study of these lines and comparative sections will show how specious is the claim that Sir John Coode and Mr. Culcheth report in favour of a deep-sea Inner Harbour.

Messrs. Bell and Scott : These men reported in 1884 on Mr. John Goodall's harbour (breakwater) scheme, and, whilst they had some criticism of Mr. Goodall's scheme on details of construction, their report was, on the whole, favourable to the scheme. We have been carefully through this report of Bell and Scott in a search for anything that might substantiate Mr. Jull's claim that the writers had reported in favour of a deep-water Inner Harbour, and we can find nothing to justify the claim.

Messrs. Cullen and Keele : These Australian engineers visited Napier in 1912 and again in 1925. They reported after each visit. In 1912 they recommended the Inner Harbour as against the Breakwater Harbour, and in 1925, in answer to the Napier Harbour Board's specific request that they should advise the Board which of the two harbour schemes they recommended, they definitely recommended the Breakwater Harbour. That is their final recommendation, made after their second visit to Napier, after further study of local conditions and with a further thirteen years' experience of the use of the breakwater at their disposal. They accompany their recommendation with the explanation that their previous recommendation was made under a misconception, based on misinformation on a material point. We therefore include Messrs. Cullen and Keele among the experienced harbour engineers who have recommended the Breakwater Harbour ; we submit that no other course is either fair to them or reasonable as an indication of their considered opinion.

We find it hard to take Mr. Jull's answer seriously.

We submit the following list of qualified engineers with harbour experience who have definitely reported in favour of the Breakwater Harbour, as against the Inner Harbour as a harbour for overseas vessels : Mr. John Goodall, M.Inst.C.E. ; Mr. F. W. Marchant, M.Inst.C.E. ; Messrs. J. P. Maxwell, M.Inst.C.E. ; Cyrus J. Williams, M.Inst.C.E. ; and J. Blair Mason, C.E. ; Messrs E. A. Cullen, M.Inst.C.E., and T. W. Keele, M.Inst.C.E. ; Mr. F. W. Furkert, A.M.I.M.E., M.Inst.C.E.

We now desire to set out a statement of the reasoning by which we have arrived at the foregoing answer to the question put to us.

INNER HARBOUR OR BREAKWATER HARBOUR FROM AN ENGINEERING POINT OF VIEW.

Broadly stated, our conclusion on the matter of the claims of the Inner Harbour is that the Inner Harbour scheme stands condemned because it is based, as to one of its essential parts, on a work that transgresses a fundamental principle of marine engineering. The work which we refer to as an essential part of the Inner Harbour scheme is the outer entrance channel, extending approximately one mile out to sea from the entrance moles. This channel, lying as it does in what is practically the open ocean, is, we are fully satisfied, contrary to marine-engineering principles and practice, and, as it supplies the means of entrance to and egress from the Inner Harbour, its defects and weaknesses become the deciding factor in the scheme as a whole.

We wish to make it clear at this point that we are now speaking of the outer channel as planned and designed by Messrs. Cullen and Keele, and (with modifications) adopted by the Board, and their consulting engineers, Messrs. Holmes and Son. This is an unprotected channel without any mole or moles. In our answer to the immediately preceding question set out in paragraph 12 hereof, we stated that it was *practicable* to construct a harbour suitable for the requirements of the district, and we had in view then a harbour approached by a channel protected by moles, making it an artificially enclosed channel. Our finding that a harbour so constructed was practicable is in accord with the finding of, for instance, Mr. F. W. Marchant, M.Inst.C.E., in his report of 1906, on page 2, where he says, "*Given sufficient money, there is no doubt that a useful harbour could have been made at the spit on the lines now proposed.*" His accompanying proposal included the formation of a breakwater or mole to protect the outer channel, on its eastern side. In principle, the unprotected channel proposed by Messrs. Cullen and Keele, and apparently adopted by Messrs. Holmes and Son, is adversely criticized by three such eminent Harbour engineers as J. P. Maxwell, Cyrus Williams, and J. Blair Mason in their report dated 1909. They say, "Even if it were practicable at a reasonable cost to cut an unprotected deep channel through this bar inwards, of which we have some doubt in the face of the fact that it is exposed to the heaviest seas, there is no doubt that in heavy weather it would be *liable to be obliterated*, wholly or in part, in which event the port would be closed until the channel reopened, which would be an intolerable inconvenience."

As to engineering practice, the knowledge of all expert witnesses before us and the records of harbour-construction throughout the world were searched for a parallel case, but no parallel case was forthcoming. Our attention was called to many channels cut through sand bars and banks, but in every case it was found that they were protected by the natural formation of the coast or by moles and breakwaters. Messrs. Holmes and Son, the Napier Harbour Board's consulting engineers, in their evidence referred to numerous harbours approached by channels. We pressed them for position, description, and details of one unprotected channel in any way comparable to that proposed at Napier, and consideration was eventually narrowed down to three which Mr. J. D. Holmes put forward—viz., Vizigapatam, in India ; Brisbane, in Queensland ; and Colon, at the entrance to the Panama Canal. At the close of Mr. Holmes's examination in chief, Vizigapatam seemed to be a parallel case. Under cross-examination, however, it was ascertained that the harbour is not yet constructed, and the records produced showed that after various reports had been obtained, some (the majority) recommending an outer breakwater harbour, and others an inner harbour, the last one on record was an inner-harbour project, the inner basin to be approached by a channel cut through a sand-bar. This is as far as the information goes, and therefore it affords no lesson or guidance for Napier. As to Brisbane, we suggest that a glance at a large-scale map of the coast of Queensland is sufficient to dissipate the suggestion

that it is a parallel case to Napier. The channel there is a protected channel, the coast being protected, in the first place, by the Great Barrier Reef, and Moreton Bay, from which the channel enters the river, being quite a protected bay. We refer to the evidence on this point of Captain A. H. Brown, who, speaking, with a knowledge of Brisbane Harbour, stated that from the entrance to Moreton Bay to the beginning of this channel is 60 miles by one route, and 30 miles by another, with land on one side and sandbanks on the other. There remains Colon. Mr. J. D. Holmes put this forward as a parallel case, and said in his evidence (see page 305, Notes of Evidence), "My point is that if captains of vessels navigate the entrance to the Panama Canal at Colon under the conditions that obtain there, there should be no difficulty about navigating the entrance to the Inner Harbour here. It is navigated at night as well as by day without the slightest difficulty. I cannot produce plans in Napier of this locality to submit to Commissioner A. C. Mackenzie."

We have been able to procure the plans that Mr. Holmes could not then produce, and we include as Maps G and H in Commission's Exhibit No. 3 plans of Colon Harbour and entrance, and plans of the proposed Napier Inner Harbour. In each case there is included, on a smaller scale, a general locality-plan. We call attention to the entrance channel at Colon, situated in Limon Bay, protected, firstly, by the coast-formation, and, secondly, by the West Breakwater and the East Breakwater. We call attention, secondly, to the plan of the proposed Inner Harbour at Napier, showing an utterly unprotected channel, and we propose to leave these plans and the quoted remark of Mr. J. D. Holmes without further comment.

One of the chief engineering problems related to the construction of this channel is that which requires all the conflicting facts and theories relating to the littoral drift and movements of the sea-bottom to be studied and reduced to a working theory. In this problem we have been guided by the engineering member of the Commission; and the result of his work has been incorporated in paragraph 10, "Development of Theories," where it appears under the subheading "Our Conclusions on the Question of Sand-drift." We beg leave here to refer Your Excellency again to that subheading, the contents of which enter into our consideration of the Inner Harbour problem from the engineering point of view. The contents of that subheading, "Conclusions on the Question of Sand-drift," also introduce and are related to the question of dredging the outer channel, with which we now propose to deal.

DREDGING.

We are of opinion that the Board's consulting engineers have taken too optimistic a view of the possibilities and probabilities of cutting the outer entrance channel to the Inner Harbour by means of dredging, and of maintaining it in a workable condition by dredging. Mr. J. D. Holmes says (page 301, Notes of Evidence), "We intend using the dredge outside when possible, and inside at other times. There would be no loss of time under these circumstances."

We desire to call attention to this witness's evidence on pages 300 to 304 inclusive in the Notes of Evidence, as supporting our conclusion that he has taken the most optimistic view of every portion of this problem, and refused to admit any element of doubt into his calculations. He does not agree with the conclusions of engineers of experience like Messrs. J. P. Maxwell, Cyrus Williams, and J. Blair Mason; and he stated in answer to the Chairman that the warnings of these engineers on the matter of the practicability and safety of this outer channel did not even raise a doubt in his mind. He was referred to Messrs. Cullen and Keele's warnings that the cost of maintenance dredging on this outer channel when constructed would probably be high, and that it was that which made the cost of maintenance of Inner Harbour greater than the maintenance of the Outer Harbour, and that they had provided for the worst by allowing for the continuous use of the dredge, and he stated that he did not agree with that as a policy and did not think it necessary (see page 307, Notes of Evidence). He was referred to the evidence of his father, Mr. R. W. Holmes, to the effect that when the channel was cut no maintenance dredging would be necessary for three years, and was asked if he agreed with that. His answer was (see page 301), "I would not like to express an opinion on that; it is hard to say—*there are so many unknown factors.*" He was then asked by the Chairman, "When an engineer is advising a Harbour Board on a problem in which there are unknown factors which make it hard to say, what standard of care should be adopted in making the recommendation?" We desire to call particular attention to the answer which follows: "I think that the outer channel is absolutely safe; I do not think I have taken any risks."

We are of opinion that from the warnings given by the engineers we have referred to, and from the experience of the dredgemaster of the "Whakarire" (Mr. T. W. Martin) as to the practical difficulties experienced for a period of two months in trying to dredge at this point, and further that if he had to estimate the cost of dredging on that channel he would look upon it as a very difficult problem, and cost it accordingly (page 622, Notes of Evidence), a much more conservative estimate requires to be made in the matter of the cost of dredging this channel and keeping it open.

Our considered opinion is that whilst there is the bare possibility of all the uncertain factors working favourably and justifying Mr. Holmes's optimistic outlook, the probabilities of the case are that if the people of Hawke's Bay had been led into making this venture, including the purchase of a dredge to do this dredging, there would have been added one more to the list of expensive engineering fiascos on the coasts of the Dominion.

For a full detailed report on the whole question of dredging in relation to the Inner Harbour we beg leave to refer to a separate report of the engineering member of the Board, Mr. A. C. Mackenzie, appearing as Table F in the appendix. We hereby adopt that as part of our report.

With regard to the Breakwater Harbour, our conclusion, broadly stated, is that this scheme offers to the Napier Harbour Board district a feasible method of providing a reasonably good harbour for the accommodation of overseas vessels. This harbour will have its limitations; it will not be a first-class

port capable of being entered and left in any weather. It will not be a harbour of refuge for passing vessels in a storm, for there will be periods of storm when no vessel would approach the coast, let alone seek to enter this harbour. It is, however, capable of being constructed at a reasonable cost, as a harbour that under all ordinary conditions and at all states of the tide may be entered, used, and departed from by overseas vessels. It will, so constructed, be capable, in our opinion of affording shelter and facilities for working in most conditions of weather, although there will probably be times when, in view of approaching or developing bad weather, shipmasters will prefer to leave it and make for the open sea.

That these limitations exist are admitted by the most sanguine advocates of this harbour. We are favourably impressed by the service which this harbour has given during a period of forty years in an unfinished condition. We are of opinion that if it were completed by the extension of the breakwater, erection of the mole as designed, and by the erection of the new wharves with up-to-date facilities, by the deepening of berths and the reclamation of land to provide the necessary shore adjuncts, it will be a harbour that, in the words of the question before us, would be a suitable harbour, which we are prepared to recommend when the financial and economic factors make the work justifiable.

INNER AND BREAKWATER HARBOURS FROM THE NAVIGATIONAL POINT OF VIEW.

Broadly stated, our conclusion is that from the navigational point of view the Inner Harbour scheme is wholly condemned, because it requires ships to enter a channel 600 ft. wide and approximately one mile long, as an entrance to the inner channel between the moles. This outer channel is situated in the open ocean, and is exposed to winds and seas that ships seeking to enter the channel would find mostly abeam. It is also subject to a more or less heavy ocean swell, which is apt to be experienced even under the most perfect weather conditions at Napier. More than one of the ships' captains who gave evidence before us called attention to the perfectly fine weather conditions obtaining in Napier on the day on which he was speaking, testifying at the same time to the fact that out in the bay at the entrance to the proposed channel there was a pronounced ocean swell, and adding that on that day and under these conditions he would not like to attempt to take his ship into the proposed Inner Harbour.

Under the heading of "Engineering," on page 38 of this report, we include a quotation from Messrs. Maxwell, Williams, and Mason's report of the year 1900. The closing words of the paragraph from which we took that extract referred to the navigational aspect of the same difficulty, and we now add them, viz.: "In addition there would be some difficulty in navigating large vessels along such a channel during heavy weather with the seas sweeping at a considerable angle across the channel and breaking off either side of it." This opinion, expressed by engineers in 1900, was amply supported and justified in 1927 by the evidence of many experienced mariners who appeared before us.

We desire also to call attention to the evidence of Mr. J. P. Maxwell as to the effect of this unprotected open channel as an exposed opening to the Inner Harbour. He says (see page 355), after giving particulars of the destruction of shipping by a heavy "range" in the harbour of Madras, "The mistake was an exposed opening to the harbour." He continued: "I am of the opinion that the proposed entrance to the Inner Harbour here consisting as it does of 600 ft. channel dredged into the open ocean, is a mistake. Anything that may be deduced from a channel 400 ft. across and 20 ft. in depth gives no basis for forecasting what may happen in the case of an entrance 600 ft. wide and 30 ft. deep. I say that seas will sweep in and shipping will not be able to use it under such conditions." Mr. Maxwell, in his description of what had happened at Madras Harbour, spoke of ships and wharves being severely damaged, and he adds (see page 359), "It was the range at Madras Harbour that caused the trouble there, owing to a big entrance opening to the open sea." On the same page he says, "There would be a big range in the Inner Harbour just as it was at Madras, when constructed as proposed. The ships in the harbour would be unmanageable when the channel was widened, owing to the fact that the deeper the water the greater the waves and the greater their velocity. The harbour would be a dangerous trap for any ship."

A summary of the evidence of the navigational witnesses has been prepared, and it appears as Table J in the appendix. A study of this evidence shows that there is an overwhelming preponderance of expert navigator's evidence to the effect that overseas liners will not, except under ideal conditions and at high water slack, use the outer channel of the Inner Harbour. More than one of the witnesses stated that his standard of care is the avoidance of all risks. One witness pointed out that a single ship, loaded with an average cargo, seeking to use the channel, represents a risk in one bottom of from £1,250,000 to £1,500,000, and stated that he would take no avoidable risks whatever. The standard of care indicated by these answers is precisely that which we expected of master mariners and Marine Superintendents of the shipping companies. It is evidence of a nature which has not, so far as we can ascertain, been obtained and put before the Harbour Board and its constituents at any earlier stage of the harbour controversy. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this evidence, seeing that the value of a harbour as a whole depends upon the safety of its entrance. The only evidence we heard with a contrary tendency to the foregoing came from the Harbour Board's consulting engineers, who, instancing the standard of conduct of lifeboat crews, expressed the opinion that the navigating witnesses who appeared before this Commission had displayed undue caution.

The conclusion we draw from the whole of this evidence is that the entrance channel to the Inner Harbour would be apt to be looked upon with great disfavour by maritime authorities and deep-sea captains using the port of Napier.

BREAKWATER HARBOUR FROM NAVIGATIONAL STANDPOINT.

At the Breakwater Harbour there are at present two berths at which vessels of 26 ft. draught can be berthed, and also one berth suitable under fair-weather conditions for vessels drawing 18 ft. These berths are protected from the heaviest seas by a breakwater 2,830 ft. in length and having a general height of 6 ft. above high water. To complete the harbour the new works require one new pier for cargo-sheds. Then there is necessary the extension of the breakwater to the Auckland Rock, some 1,500 ft., and the construction of the western mole, about 4,000 ft. in length. There would then be necessary the dredging required to deepen the new berths to, say, 30 ft. This dredging would not be difficult work, and could proceed for the greater part of the year without interruption.

The approach to the Breakwater Harbour does not now require any dredging for vessels drawing 26 ft., nor will the approach require any dredging when the harbour is completed. It may, however, be anticipated that in the future some maintenance dredging would be required on the end of the breakwater.

The navigating witnesses were almost unanimous in the opinion that, when completed, this harbour could be entered with ease at almost any time of the day or night except when heavy weather was being experienced.

SUMMARY OF NAVIGATIONAL EVIDENCE.

Summarizing the navigational evidence as it related to both harbours, we would set out the result as follows: The points to be considered are—

(a) *Practicability of entering either Harbour when completed, at any State of the Tide, under Fair or Moderate Weather Conditions.*—Under this heading the balance of evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the Breakwater Harbour. The navigating witnesses were almost unanimous in the opinion that in the event of the proposed channel to the Inner Harbour being constructed and dredged to 34 ft. it could only be safely navigated by vessels drawing 26 ft. at high-water slack in moderately calm water and with the assistance of a tug, and that only one vessel could make use of the channel during any one period of slack water. With regard to the breakwater, overseas and coastal vessels drawing up to 26 ft. could make use of low-water slack for entering the harbour, whilst vessels of greater draught could enter as soon as the tide had risen sufficiently, and would not be hindered by tidal currents.

(b) *Practicability of entering or departing from either Harbour (when completed) at Night.*—Under this heading the balance of evidence is overwhelmingly in favour of the Breakwater Harbour.

(c) *Liability of Damage to Vessel or Interference with Working Cargo, due to Range.*—The evidence satisfies us at the present time that the class of vessels using the Inner Harbour are whilst in that harbour less liable to interference by range than are the class of vessels using the Breakwater Harbour while berthed in that harbour. In considering this point it must be remembered that the breakwater is in an unfinished state. Practically all the engineering and navigational witnesses were agreed that when the breakwater is completed out to the Auckland Rock, and the enclosure of the harbour-basin made complete by the building of the western mole, the trouble from range would be very greatly diminished. On the other hand there is strong evidence to the effect that if the entrance channel to the Inner Harbour were widened and deepened as proposed, and the sand-spit (which now forms a natural submarine breakwater) removed, there would be a considerable increase in the amount of range admitted to the Inner Harbour basin. Looking at each harbour as it would be if completed according to these plans, and comparing them in the matter of liability to range, we are of opinion that then the balance of evidence is in favour of the Breakwater Harbour on this point also.

(d) *Shelter afforded to Vessels when berthed.*—Here it is clear that the balance of evidence distinctly favours the Inner Harbour. Of two vessels of equal size safely berthed at, say, the suggested new pier in the Breakwater Harbour on the one hand, or one of the proposed new overseas berths in the Inner Harbour on the other hand, we think it is clear that the vessel in the Inner Harbour would be in more protected surroundings. This advantage in favour of the Inner Harbour must be taken into account, but it is of course obvious that the advantages attaching to a berth within a harbour are not attainable, while the disadvantages of the entrance channel tend to keep vessels out of that harbour. Furthermore, there still remains the question of range, considered in the immediately preceding paragraph.

USE OF TUG.

If a tug is required we are satisfied from the evidence that towage charges will be an appreciable addition to the charges of the port. This question was put to most of the navigating witnesses, and their evidence shows that in regard to the Inner Harbour only one expressed the opinion that a tug would not be required. In relation to the Breakwater Harbour only two witnesses testified that they would require the services of a tug.

INNER OR BREAKWATER HARBOUR FROM ECONOMIC POINT OF VIEW.

Our conclusion on this matter, broadly stated, is that there is a great deal of difference from the economic point of view between the two harbours. The question of the cost of constructing, and the consequential annual interest charge, enters into this aspect of the question, and is dealt with in detail under the next succeeding paragraph, dealing with the question of whether or not the construction of the recommended harbour can be justified. We may say here briefly that we accept and agree with Cullen and Keele's conclusion that the Breakwater Harbour is to be recommended as requiring a smaller initial capital outlay and a smaller annual cost of maintenance. As to those economic considerations that are based on or related to such factors as transport facilities and the proximity of shore adjuncts, the balance of advantage lies at the present time in favour of the Inner

Harbour. We have, however, on this point two considerations to submit: The first is that, even as this balance of advantage stands at the present time, it does not nearly outweigh the preponderating tendency of the engineering and navigational aspects. In the second place, the present position can be largely altered, and the necessary facilities attached to the breakwater at a reasonable cost when other aspects of the whole problem justify the construction of that harbour.

We have stated above that we are satisfied that the Breakwater Harbour will require a smaller capital outlay than the Inner Harbour. We desire to comment on the figures and estimates supplied to us in evidence relating to the construction of the two harbour schemes which we were inquiring into. We expected, and we think we were reasonably entitled to expect, that in respect of each harbour we would be supplied with figures representing the best estimate that could be given of the cost of a definite harbour scheme. Our expectations were not realized. The estimates of costs given to us were not of the actual cost of a specified work, but so-called "comparative" costs prepared as propaganda in a party dispute on the merits of the rival harbours. More than once we pressed our requests for statements of actual cost of complete harbour requirements in each case, but our requests were not, and probably at the time of the disposal of witnesses after the inquiry was opened could not, be supplied. Our request was: "Take into account everything that is necessary to construct and equip the Inner Harbour according to the requirements and policy of the Harbour Board, and tell us what that will cost, take into account precisely the same details and requirements in relation to the Outer Harbour and tell us what the total cost would be." We expressed our readiness, when these figures were supplied to us, to listen to any explanations in the way of comparative adjustments or explanations that might tend to show where and why one scheme, starting from the point of view of the present condition of that harbour, might require more expenditure than the other at a given point, but the Board's consulting engineers did not supply us with what we wanted. As an instance of the point of view from which the evidence on questions of cost was tendered to us, we refer to Mr. J. D. Holmes's evidence (page 100, Notes of Evidence). He says there, "To bring the two schemes on to a basis on which it would be *fair to compare their costs*, we include the raising of the height of the breakwater by 10 ft. throughout its length, as recommended by Cullen and Keele's 1912 report, page 9, col. 1, paragraph 3; so that the Outer Harbour would afford shelter comparable to that found in the Inner Harbour."

We wish it to be noted that there was no suggestion that the Harbour Board had ever considered the matter of raising the breakwater, and it was admitted that they had never instructed their consulting engineers to consider or estimate the cost of that work, and yet here we have an item of £223,000 added by the consulting engineers on their own initiative, the object being, to quote Mr. Holmes's own words, "to arrive at a basis on which it would be fair to compare." We cannot refrain from the comment that Mr. Holmes in his evidence announced himself as prepared strongly to recommend the Inner Harbour, and he stated under cross-examination that he could see no redeeming feature at all in the Breakwater Harbour. This being his attitude of mind towards the two schemes, we make no further comment on the fact that £223,000 is without instructions added to the cost of one of the schemes so that the comparison may be fair.

Again, at page 158 of the same witness's evidence (we preface this quotation with reference to the fact that the Breakwater Harbour at present possesses a wharf providing berths for two ships drawing up to 28 ft., whilst the Inner Harbour can accommodate nothing with a greater draught than 15 ft.): "I have allowed for two boats only at Inner Harbour because two are allowed for at Outer Harbour. Cullen and Keele's modified scheme was for four boats. I could not say what additions I would have to make to accommodate four boats; there would be extra dredging and wharving. In our modifications *we cut out two wharves, and altered the quay and the depth of dredging. We only did this for comparative purposes.*"

Here again we are apprised of the fact that an estimate is being put forward for a work that corresponds with nothing the Harbour Board had in view, and which the Board had never instructed the consulting engineers to estimate for. As is pointed out, Cullen and Keele's scheme was for four overseas berths at the Inner Harbour, and (a fact we are dealing with more fully later on), up to the point when this evidence was given there was no suggestion of any other policy than a four-berth Inner Harbour.

The Chairman protested again strongly at this point in the evidence and asked why the Commission should be required to take figures based on something that nobody contemplated, and work up from them to a cost of the harbour that was contemplated. The only answer is that which is apparent from the evidence—viz., that this is done for comparative purposes, and "to be fair" (obviously to the Inner Harbour scheme).

Again, Mr. R. W. Holmes in his evidence on page 216, discussing Cullen and Keele's 1925 estimates in relation to Holmes and Son's 1927 estimates, said: "The item given for the construction of a quay 2,600 ft. in length must be reduced to £114,000, as a *comparison* is now being made between additional accommodation for two ocean liners in the Breakwater Harbour, and the same number in the Inner Harbour." To Chairman: "I cannot say who gave instructions for estimates to be drawn up for two overseas berths at Inner Harbour." Again at page 95 of the evidence of Mr. J. D. Holmes: "The reference I made yesterday to the height of the breakwater was made in regard to the comparison of the amount of shelter provided to shipping between the Inner and Outer Harbour. *This is necessary when comparing the cost of the two schemes.* You cannot compare schemes unless the facilities and other conditions are comparable." Again, on some occasions items of cost were left out of both schemes, the explanation being that a certain thing in one harbour would balance the cost of the corresponding thing in the other harbour. The result of this is that we are left with very little assistance from the Board's consulting engineers in our endeavour to arrive at the cost of construction of either of the harbours as outlined by the engineering proposals that have been before the Board. This has increased our

difficulties in an endeavour to answer the question that is now before us. Furthermore, we got no assistance on the cost of maintenance of the two harbours. See Notes of Evidence, page 307 (on top of page). *The Chairman to Mr. J. D. Holmes*: "Have you prepared any estimate of the expected cost of maintenance of the harbours?" *Answer*: "No, I have not."

Another unsatisfactory feature of the case as prepared by and for the Harbour Board is related to what we have just been dealing with, and no doubt to some extent is accountable for the unsatisfactory nature of the estimates supplied to us. This unsatisfactory feature is that the Harbour Board had no definite scheme reduced to plans and specifications, but instead its requirements were measured by a shifting standard dictated by the fortunes of the rival schemes during the process of the inquiry.

We refer again to the evidence of Mr. J. D. Holmes on page 100. He said in answer to the Chairman, "We have estimates drawn up, but no complete written scheme and estimates have been drawn up. The scheme has never been submitted to the Board as complete. The figures were completed only last night."

After the Commission had been sitting from the 4th to the 22nd August the Chairman called attention to the unsatisfactory features that we are now discussing. We call attention to the newspaper report appearing on page 49 of the *Hawke's Bay Herald* daily reports (Commission's Exhibit No. 4). Mr. R. W. Holmes was in the box. The Chairman stated that the Commission had had its difficulties enormously increased by the form in which this evidence was tendered, and said it was surely reasonable to say to the breakwater party, "Let us see your plans and specifications and say what it will cost," and it was surely reasonable enough to say the same thing to the Inner Harbour party. The Chairman said, further, that it seemed as though some of the figures had been brought into the evidence to score a point under the considerations of local controversy. Mr. Holmes interjected that he had attempted to place the harbours on an equal footing, and the Chairman replied, "We are not concerned with placing them on an equal footing; we are here to reply to the Minister as to what we consider the most practicable scheme, and we want to know the cost of that scheme."

We now quote from page 49, Commission's Exhibit No. 4:—

"The Chairman continued, there should have been an estimate put forward and we have not got it. I understood from Mr. Jull that the Board's scheme was to provide berths for four overseas vessels according to Cullen and Keele's modified scheme. Now we are told nothing about that scheme, and the only figures we have before us deal with a scheme for two ocean-going ships. The engineers estimates do not correspond with those quoted in the Board's policy. We have not yet had put forward any figures as to the scheme to which the Board has attached itself. What we have had is something quite different."

When the Commission met next morning the Chairman put forward a written request setting out the basis on which the Commission required a statement of the cost of an Inner Harbour scheme with provision for four berths in accordance with the Board's policy. The Chairman stated that the Commissioners did not see why they should be required to take figures relating to something else as a basis, and from that try to work up the cost of the harbour proposed by the Board. At this stage Mr. A. E. Jull, the Chairman of the Harbour Board, asked, through the Harbour Board's counsel, to be recalled. This was done. He was then asked (page 216, Notes of Evidence),

Is the Harbour Board's present policy a scheme for constructing an Inner Harbour with four ocean-going berths or two ocean-going berths?

Answer: It is for the construction of an Inner Harbour with two ocean-going berths, with facilities for expansion when needed.

Question by the Chairman: Has that policy ever been placed before the public of this rating district, and if so, when?

Answer: We have not published the policy of two or four or any number of berths.

Question by the Chairman: This, then, is the first public announcement of a two-berth Inner Harbour?

Answer: I do not remember any previous announcement of a two-berth harbour.

In commenting on this we wish to point out that on the 12th August Mr. J. D. Holmes, referring to Cullen and Keele's scheme as the basis for his estimates, said: "Their suggestion, as outlined in the 1925 report, was to extend the West Quay a sufficient distance to accommodate four berths, the length being 2,600 ft." Mr. A. E. Jull had already put in Cullen and Keele's 1925 report as the basis of the Board's policy, and the engineers in that report said, on page 4, col. 2, "It happens that the accommodation for four ocean liners and other vessels that require berthage which we are now asked to estimate the probable cost of, nearly corresponds in extent with that we proposed and illustrated formerly." Lower down in the same column they say, "This accommodation we fix at 2,600 lineal feet of quay, and our estimates are for that length."

The Secretary of the Harbour Board, Mr. J. P. Kenny, in answer to our question, "What do you understand to be the general policy of the Board?" replied: "The prosecution of the Inner Harbour as designed by Messrs. Cullen and Keele." When asked when he first heard of the suggestion of a two-berth Inner Harbour, he stated that it was when Mr. Jull made the pronouncement in the witness-box on the 23rd August.

The Harbourmaster of the Napier Harbour Board, Captain White-Parsons, in his evidence stated definitely that the harbour required berthage for four overseas liners. Mr. K. McLeay, an ex-member of the Harbour Board, and a member of the Inner Harbour League, stated that the first he had ever heard of a proposed two-berth Inner Harbour was Mr. Jull's pronouncement already referred to.

We are perfectly satisfied that Mr. Jull's pronouncement on the 23rd August was merely a tactical move to avoid placing before the Commission estimates including the cost of making four new overseas berths at the Inner Harbour. It may have been good tactics, in that if any step might be

successful in procuring the construction of the Inner Harbour as far as the provision of two berths for overseas vessels, the district would then be committed to the Inner Harbour scheme; but nevertheless it amply justifies our statement that the Harbour Board entered on this inquiry with no definite scheme reduced to plans and specifications, but with requirements measured by a shifting standard dictated by the fortunes of their scheme during the course of the inquiry.

At pages 234 and 235 the same tendency is shown in the evidence of Mr. R. W. Holmes:—

Questioned by the Chairman: Would not a statement of the Board's policy as to the amount of berthage required for the port's trade usually be the basis of an engineer's estimate of cost?

Answer: Certainly.

Question: The absence of such a statement leaves the estimates elastic and indefinite?

Answer: The Board would then leave the matter to the discretion of the engineers.

Question: In your son's evidence he said at page 100, "to bring the two schemes on to a basis in which it would be fair to compare their costs, we include the raising of the height of the breakwater by 10 ft. throughout its length." Were your instructions sufficiently elastic to enable you to include that figure of £223,000 without a statement of the Board's intentions in the matter of the height of the breakwater?

Answer: Yes.

Question: Have you ever since your appointment here been acquainted with the Board's policy as to the number of ocean-going berths required?

Answer: No.

Then again there was evidence and admissions of hurry and unpreparedness in the matter of these figures and estimates. It is only fair to the Board's consulting engineers that we point this out. Mr. J. D. Holmes said on page 90, "We have been pushed for time in respect to giving evidence before this Commission." At page 100 he says, "The statement which we are making, which was completed last night, has been prepared under instructions from the Harbour Board for this Commission and not for the Board." On page 149 he said, "I did not take into account labour costs, and work up from them; I took average cost per yard. If I had done so we would have been on the work for about two months instead of two weeks." In answer to an obvious question at this point he continued, "I would have more faith in my estimates if I had had the two months. The work of making up a whole case had been done in a fortnight."

Another feature of the estimates submitted by the engineers is that, having arrived at an engineering basis of the cost of one of the harbour schemes, they then purported to place a valuation of the land which was reclaimed as an incidental work, and *to deduct that value and call the net result the net cost of harbour-construction.* Thus, in connection with the Inner Harbour schemes, they arrive at a gross cost of £461,000; to that they add the estimated cost of roading reclaimed areas, £83,000, and subtract an estimated value of the reclaimed land, £276,000, and call the result, £268,000, *the net cost of the harbour.*

It may incidentally be pointed out that Mr. J. D. Holmes stated that the basis of this valuation was that a member of his staff *got it from somebody at the Harbour Board's offices, and that it was the selling value of the land.* This method of presentation did not trouble us to anything like the same extent as the other unsatisfactory features we called attention to, because we simply ignored the question of the land and the relative deduction from cost; but we would call attention to the probable effect on the public mind of this fallacious method of putting forward an estimate of engineering costs of a harbour. When this Board seeks to build a harbour it must borrow the full amount required to construct the harbour, and it must pay interest on the amount so borrowed. The value of the land reclaimed has no bearing whatever upon these two elements in the Harbour Board's problems. Where the reclaimed land will help will be when the rents it produces amount to more than interest upon the cost of reclaiming it. If and when that happens, the reclamations will be rendering some assistance to the Harbour Board in its finances. The extent to which assistance may be expected will be dealt with fully by us in that part of our report which deals with the question of reclamation.

We tender the foregoing explanation of the method adopted by the Board and some of its witnesses in supplying us with figures and estimates because two results flow naturally from the cause. One is that, even if we could reduce the Harbour Board's ill-defined and elastic proposals to a definite scheme, we cannot attach to it a reliable estimate of the cost of that scheme. The other is that this unsatisfactory feature of the evidence contributed largely to the length of the proceedings and the quantity of the work that we have had to perform. We have all, particularly the engineering member of the Commission, spent weary days trying from unsatisfactory materials to produce some stable and intelligible result in the form of estimates of cost. Most of that time would have been saved and the result would have been more satisfactory if the Harbour Board had come prepared with costs of a definite scheme, put forward on its merits as a scheme, and not as arithmetical arguments in a party dispute.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS AS AFFECTING INNER AND OUTER HARBOUR DEVELOPMENT.

From an economic point of view the first consideration is naturally the capital cost of developing either harbour, and the subsequent annual cost of maintenance. Exact estimates for either scheme are (for reasons already given) not available, but the approximate figures as submitted by various engineers show that the capital cost of developing the Outer Harbour at the breakwater would be considerably less than the cost of developing the Inner Harbour. This statement is justified by figures put forward elsewhere, prepared by Mr. A. C. Mackenzie (Commissioner). The annual cost of maintenance in the case of the Inner Harbour would also exceed that of the Outer Harbour by the cost of the dredging necessary to maintain the outer channel from the entrance at the moles to deep water. This item for maintenance dredging is estimated to amount approximately to £10,368 per

annum, and it might even exceed this. This heavy annual charge is a most serious objection to the Inner Harbour scheme. It would—if the above estimate is correct—eat up all the rents produced by £207,000 worth of reclaimed lands.

As regards harbour layout and operation from the landward side, the Inner Harbour scheme presents some advantageous economic features. The site of the wharves is more immediately contiguous to existing warehouses and bulk stores, and also to the road and the State railway transport system. There is also land or ground which could be reclaimed in the vicinity, available for the future expansion of commerce and industry. Furthermore, the problem of haulage from warehouse to ship's side and *vice versa* is more easily handled, and the distance from half a mile to a mile less than it is in the case of the Outer Harbour; and, generally speaking, owing to the Inner Harbour having always been the main shipping-point both for roadstead and coastal trade, the present layout of both public and private facilities, which has grown up around that harbour, would require comparatively little adaptation to the working of the Inner Harbour as a deep-sea port.

On the other hand, the Outer Harbour is about a mile distant from the present bulk stores and warehouses. It has at its immediate base no land for the buildings, &c., and this space would require to be provided by reclamation from the sea-front. Even then such space would be probably so comparatively limited that it would require to be reserved rather for the use of the Harbour Board than for private enterprise. This is, however, perhaps not so essential, as it is apparent that, for many years to come, wool and other heavy goods will continue to be handled and warehoused in the existing stores situated close to the terminal point of the State railway.

These conditions entail continuous additional haulage to and from the wharves at the Outer or Breakwater Harbour and the State railway terminal or the bulk stores adjacent thereto, while in the case of cargo such as meat, which is railed direct from country loading-points to ship's side, there would be, in loading at the Outer Harbour, the disadvantage of one mile extra railgauge. There is certainly a set-off against this, in so far as merchants with business places in Napier and Hastings are concerned, as in such case the transport by road of goods from the Outer Harbour to and from their premises would be less than to and from the Inner Harbour, but the net cost of extra haulage to and from the Outer Harbour, as compared with the Inner Harbour, would probably amount to several thousands of pounds per annum.

Taking the various economic factors into consideration, however, it is apparent that the higher capital cost and the heavier annual charge for maintenance in case of the Inner Harbour outweigh very considerably the lesser disadvantage of the extra cost of haulage to and from the breakwater. The disability of there being less space available at the Outer Harbour for stores and warehouses than at the Inner Harbour will be less seriously felt as time progresses, and transport and wharf facilities become better developed and more easily operated. It is impossible to lay out any large main port so that private bulk stores and warehouses shall all be close to the various wharves, and, taking the Inner and Outer Harbours at Napier as component parts of a general harbour scheme, and visualizing the expansion of the port in the more distant future, it is apparent that in time to come, the general layout of transport, warehouse, and harbour facilities will be quite as efficient and satisfactory as at any other main port in the Dominion. In fact, the eventual development of the port with the deep-sea wharves and overseas sorting-sheds at the breakwater, the road and railway transport system along the sea-front to the State railway-yards, and the bulk warehouses and stores adjacent both to these yards and to the coastal loading-berths at the Inner Harbour, with plenty of space in the background available for future industrial development, will be really a more compact and workable system than exists or can exist at most other main ports in the Dominion.

This will be more obvious if the ultimate position of Napier be compared with that of other main ports. The business centre of the city itself will be within a mile to a mile and a half from either the overseas or the coastal berths, with good access by road; and the various harbour facilities, both overseas and coastal, will impinge upon a sea-frontage of about a similar length, with sufficient space on the landward side for road and railway transport and for warehouse accommodation. In the matter of proximity and accessibility Auckland and Wellington are no better off; while Lyttelton, Dunedin, and Invercargill are much less favourably situated. From an economic point of view the problem of ultimate harbour-development at Napier on the lines indicated has distinctly attractive features.

PART 14.—CAN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE RECOMMENDED HARBOUR BE JUSTIFIED FINANCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY ?

The next question submitted to us is, "Can the expenditure of the money necessary to construct such a harbour (taking into account the amount already expended) be justified from the financial and economic aspect?"

The words "such a harbour" mean the harbour which under the immediately preceding heading we have recommended—viz., the Breakwater (or Outer) Harbour. The words "to construct such a harbour (taking into account the amount already expended)" we take as meaning to complete the existing Breakwater Harbour in accordance with the general description which we gave in Part 12, when we decided that it was practicable to complete the Breakwater Harbour.

In round figures, the amount already expended upon the Breakwater Harbour is £448,000, and, again in round approximate figures, the cost of completing it according to the description adopted above, is £448,000. The factors to be taken into account in deciding whether this additional expenditure can be justified from the financial and economic aspect, and in the light of the above estimate of the cost of completion, are, on one side, (1) the extra interest charge involved, after

raising the necessary loan-money to complete the harbour; (2) the extra cost of maintenance of the completed and enlarged harbour; (3) the extra working-costs, including under this heading the cost of handling at the wharf and sheds the goods which at the present time are lightered in the bay; and, on the other side, (4) the extra revenue to be derived from the use of the completed and augmented harbour facilities; (5) the assistance to this direct harbour revenue which may be obtained from rates levied on land within the Harbour Board's province; and (6) the rents to be received from the Board's endowments, principally in the shape of reclaimed lands, as they will be as the Board's reclamation schemes proceed with the recommended harbour scheme. Another factor to be accounted for on the credit side is the saving of lighterage to the community, although this would not directly affect the Harbour Board or be recorded in its accounts. Finally, by way of fully defining the question before answering it, we place a time-limit on the scope of the question. We are not viewing it as a question whether eventually the completion of the harbour can be justified financially and economically, but as to whether now or in the near future—say, within a period of ten to fifteen years—the undertaking of this work can be justified. Our answer to Your Excellency's question is, "No." It is our opinion, after a perusal of all the evidence and taking into account all the foregoing factors, that from the financial and economic point of view the completion of the Breakwater Harbour cannot be justified now or in the immediate future. We proceed now to set out the considerations that have led us to this conclusion, and this requires us to make (1) an economic survey of the trade, industry, and resources of Hawke's Bay and surrounding districts, and (2) an analysis of the financial position of the Napier Harbour Board and the Harbour Rating District.

ECONOMIC SURVEY OF THE TRADE, INDUSTRY, AND RESOURCES OF HAWKE'S BAY.

(1) A trade analysis for the four years ending the 30th September, 1926, shows that Napier Harbour is the clearing-house for 216,633 tons of inwards and outwards cargo, the respective average quantities per annum being—134,330 tons inwards, 82,303 tons outwards; annual average trade of port, 216,633 tons. The harbour serves a population of 65,600 in Hawke's Bay, and about 22,200 in adjoining districts.

The area of production, indicated by the red boundary on the map appearing as Map I in Commission's Exhibit No. 3, is 6,860,000 acres, which is classified as follows: Pastoral lands, 4,500,000 acres; agricultural and grazing, 710,000 acres; unoccupied, 1,650,000 acres: total, 6,860,000 acres. It will be noted that the area occupied by the various towns is not represented in this classification, for the obvious reason that the total area so occupied is comparatively small, and a separate heading is not required for the purpose of the foregoing classification.

EXPORTS (ACTUAL).

(2) The principal exports from Hawke's Bay are meat and wool, and, taking the Harbour Board returns for the four years ending the 30th September, 1926, the average annual export trade in these products is—Wool and skins, 88,272 bales per annum; mutton and lamb, 901,680 carcasses per annum; beef, 4,933 tons per annum.

(3) In comparison with the four other main ports, Napier ranks third in volume of meat, wool, skins, and tallow combined, and fourth in the total volume of all exports, including dairying produce. The comparative figures showing the *average annual volume* (in tons) of pastoral produce shipped at main ports as compiled by the Government Statistician for a period of four years ending the 30th September, 1926, are as under:—

	Wellington.	Auckland.	Lyttelton.	Napier.	Dunedin.
Meat	33,888	12,236	23,614	20,421	6,659
Wool	28,893	10,589	19,437	19,134	15,127
Skins and hides	4,882	4,854	948	1,180	3,743
Tallow	5,620	3,813	3,593	2,464	1,420
Dairy-produce	27,683	45,063	3,222	548	4,412
Total (in tons)	100,966	76,555	50,814	43,747	31,361

(4) EXPORTS (POTENTIAL).

Fruitgrowing.

Climatic and soil conditions in certain parts of Hawke's Bay, notably near Hastings, are particularly favourable for apple and pear growing for export. The orchards are also well situated for internal trade, and a large business in fruit is carried on with other centres in the North Island. The output for exports in pears and apples last season was 50,000 cases, and in the course of the next two or three seasons is expected to reach a total of 150,000 cases per annum; while in the more distant future, when orchards just planted have come into full bearing, the total output will be very much larger. In fact, an optimistic calculation indicates that under favourable conditions the annual output might in eight or ten years reach a total of 500,000 cases. At present the whole of the fruit is shipped via Wellington under the auspices of the Fruit Control Board, but, as Hastings is only distant about fourteen miles by rail from the port of Napier, the Hawke's Bay fruitgrowers naturally look towards Napier as their ultimate shipping-point.

No doubt this objective may be eventually attained, but for some years to come it is evident that the advantages to be gained by concentrating fruit-shipments at Wellington, and thereby securing prompt despatch to the London market, outweigh any smaller benefits attainable by shipping via Napier, even if the facilities of that port were developed to the same extent as at Wellington. It has been suggested in evidence that the Napier Harbour Board should take into consideration the desirableness of erecting a suitable cool store for fruit, and thereby provide for the handling of the Hastings trade. Such provision would not, however, in the absence of berthing facilities for overseas ships, do away with the handicap of lightering fruit to vessels in the roadstead; and, in addition, the comparatively small shipments made at Napier would very frequently be delayed in despatch from New Zealand, as it would be only a rare occurrence for a steamer loading fruit to make Napier her final port of departure for London. The erection and maintaining of cool storage is therefore not within the region of practical Harbour Board politics at present, and may well be left in abeyance until Napier is in a position to provide an enclosed port and wharf loading for overseas steamers. Fruitgrowers meantime would, of course, have to put up with the longer railway journey to Wellington and the extra cost of freight; but against this they must take into consideration the value of prompt loading and despatch at Wellington to London, and the advantage to be gained from placing their fruit on the London market perhaps three or four weeks sooner than they could hope to do by shipping via Napier.

Evidence has been given as to the delays which occur in railway transit between Hastings and Wellington cool store; but there is no doubt that, as the Hastings output increased, the New Zealand Railway Department may be reasonably asked to furnish special through fruit-trains and a sufficient supply of ventilated fruit-wagons. When the time eventually arrives for shipping via Napier the Harbour will do well to confer not only with the Hawke's Bay Fruitgrowers' Association, but also with the Fruit Control Board, and to secure the co-operation of all parties in the arrangements in regard to cool storage and other facilities for loading fruit. A careful examination of capital and operating costs of cool storage and revenue to be derived therefrom will be, of course, necessary before embarking on the venture.

The following schedule shows the comparison of transport and shipping charges on fruit from Hastings via Wellington and Napier:—

<i>Charges on Fruit from Hastings to F.O.B.</i>							Per Case.	
Via Wellington (187 miles)—							d.	
Railage at 30s. 3d. per ton weight	8·07	
Cool storage	6	
Wharfage, 1s. 6d. per ton measurement	0·72	
Total							..	<u>14·79</u>
Via Napier (14 miles)—								
Railage at 6s. 5d. per ton weight	1·71	
Lighterage at 10s., Storage at 1s., Wharfage at 2s. 9d. per ton measurement	6·6	
Total							..	<u>8·31</u>

Difference, 6·48d. per case.

(4A) *Dairy-products.*

There seems to be no reason to anticipate any marked increase in shipments of dairy-produce via Napier. The tonnage for the last four years certainly shows a recent upward tendency, as is evidenced by the following record:—

Exports, Butter and Cheese.

—		1922-23.	1923-24.	1924-25.	1925-26.
Butter—		Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
Overseas	Nil	49	450	939
Coastal	17	9	18	10
Cheese—					
Overseas	Nil	Nil	27	49
Coastal	52	41	24	24

The principal Hawke's Bay factories, however, lie on the border-line between Wellington and Napier, and the natural flow of the dairy trade from Dannevirke and the surrounding districts is towards Wellington, where the principal buying agencies are established, and where prompt despatch can be given to London and other overseas markets. Such factories as lie closer to Napier will doubtless continue to ship via that port, but the prospect of new factories springing up close to Napier is not apparent, and, all things considered, it would be too optimistic to expect a large increase in the volume of dairy-produce for shipment via Napier, even if that port were developed sufficiently to provide the same loading facilities as Wellington.

(4B) *Hemp.*

No evidence was tendered in regard to hemp-production in Hawke's Bay, but the Harbour Board returns show that the undernoted tonnage was transhipped at Napier from coastal boats to overseas vessels. This hemp is produced at mills situated at or near Wairoa and Waikokopu, and when sold to London is sent down the coast and transhipped at Napier. When, however, shipment is made to Australia, the hemp is sent coastwise to Wellington, and transhipped thence to one of the intercolonial steamers. The latter course was adopted in 1925-26, and this is the reason why no hemp was handled at Napier last year: 1922-23, 1,316 tons; 1923-24, 1,682 tons; 1924-25, 766 tons; 1925-26, Nil.

Apart from the question of Wairoa and Waikokopu hemp, however, we are informed by the Chief Hemp Grader that a scheme for utilizing the swamp lands at Lake Pokawa or Tehauke for flax-production is now in operation, and, as the country is well adapted for flax-growing, a considerable output may be expected. Further information given by hemp-exporters is to the effect that it is safe to say that in six years' time an output of from 1,000 to 2,000 tons per annum may be expected from Tehauke mills, while it is anticipated that if the results from the present areas are satisfactory other swamp lands will be brought into production in the same way. Hemp may therefore be looked upon as a potential export from Napier in the future; but it must always be remembered that so long as the present shipping-expenses at Napier, including lighterage, are on so high a scale the tendency will be for the hemp to be railed to Wellington in the same way as the bulk of the dairy produce.

(5) IMPORTS.

Napier is an active distributing centre, operating both by land and coastal routes. The area of consumption covered is practically the same as the area of production, except that certain outlying portions come within the competitive influence of the distributing trade from Gisborne, Auckland, and Wellington. These debatable areas are excluded from the whole area by a blue line, and within the restricted area thus delineated the population is estimated at 54,400 persons. (See Map I, Commission's Exhibit No. 3.) The purchasing-power, however, is high, as might be expected from the volume of exports, and the average tonnage of imports—viz., 134,330 tons for the four years 1922-26—is sufficient evidence of this. The following table shows a comparison of the volume of imports over a period of four years with those of other main ports, including both inwards cargo and transhipments:—

	Napier.	Dunedin.	Lyttelton.	Wellington.	Auckland.
	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.	Tons.
1922-23	114,429	157,221	269,950	1,039,639	1,205,972
1923-24	140,009	311,994	459,860	1,166,630	1,417,637
1924-25	133,504	349,331	511,403	1,366,573	1,572,627
1925-26	149,380	333,088	484,959	1,364,465	1,492,398
Totals	537,322	1,151,634	1,726,172	4,937,307	5,688,634
Average volume per annum	134,330	287,908	431,543	1,234,327	1,422,158

(6) INDUSTRIAL.

In common with other centres in the Dominion, Napier looks forward hopefully to the time when manufactures and industries can become sufficiently established to provide employment for a larger city population, which will in turn furnish a local market for a greater portion of the products of the soil. Unfortunately, these hopes can only be realized in the more distant future. Napier serves too small a population and is too near the large manufacturing centres of the Dominion to compete successfully at present in such industries as might have a chance of success. Furthermore, Hawke's Bay does not possess natural resources, such as mineral deposits, which lend themselves to successful industrial-establishment. For these reasons, therefore, it would be altogether too optimistic to take into account the growth of manufactures or industry as a practical factor in respect to harbour-development in the near future.

(7) PAST SHIPPING RECORDS.

An examination of the Harbour Board's records to ascertain the extent of shipping accommodated in the past, and the tendencies indicated by comparative figures, has also revealed useful information. It is noteworthy that there is no decided tendency for the number of vessels calling at the port to increase, although the tonnage accommodation has grown greater. Indeed, a remarkable fact is that in the matter of one class of vessel—viz., coastal and inter-colonial passenger steamers—there is a marked falling-off as compared with pre-war conditions; but this diminishing of trade is shown by other New Zealand ports, and is due to causes beyond the control of Hawke's Bay and its harbour officials and policy.

The following figures, taken from the Napier Harbour Board's Annual Report of 1926, illustrate the movements. We have extracted them from Exhibits No. 37, 38, 39, 62, and 63, to show the number of vessels, tonnage, and cargo landed or shipped at the Roadstead, Outer (Breakwater), and Inner Harbour.

PORT OF NAPIER: 1ST JULY, 1925, TO 30TH JUNE, 1927.

Roadstead (Exhibit No. 37).

Number of Vessels.	Net Tonnage registered.	Cargo landed. Tons.	Cargo shipped. Tons.
1	Under 1,000 tons	.. 21,799	84,593
3	From 2,000 to 3,000 tons		
16	From 3,000 to 4,000 tons		
14	From 4,000 to 5,000 tons		
44	From 5,000 to 6,000 tons		
19	From 6,000 to 7,000 tons		
19	From 7,000 to 8,000 tons		
116			

Time occupied discharging and shipping, 251 days 20 hours 30 minutes.

Outer Harbour (at Breakwater).

Oversea Liners (Exhibit No. 38) :—

Number of Vessels.	Net Tonnage registered.	Cargo landed. Tons.	Cargo shipped. Tons.
1	Under 1,000 tons	.. 45,786	5,552
15	From 2,000 to 3,000 tons		
29	From 3,000 to 4,000 tons		
1	From 4,000 to 5,000 tons		
46			

Time occupied discharging and shipping, 183 days 21 hours 35 minutes.

Coastal and Intercolonial Vessels (at Breakwater), (Exhibit No. 62) :—

Number of Vessels.	Net Tonnage registered.	Cargo landed. Tons.	Cargo shipped. Tons.
15	Under 500 tons	.. 124,327	24,528
9	From 500 to 1,000 tons		
12	From 1,000 to 1,500 tons		
14	From 1,500 to 1,910 tons		

Time occupied discharging and shipping, 116 days 8 hours 31 minutes.

Inner Harbour.

Locally-owned Coastal Vessels (Exhibit No. 39) :—

	Cargo landed. Tons.	Cargo shipped. Tons.
From 8 to 100 tons register, 518 trips	15,648	23,734
Coastal vessels (Exhibit No. 63), from 29 to 933 tons—337 trips	Inwards. 70,356	Outwards. 23,476

Summary.

	Cargo landed. Tons.	Cargo shipped. Tons.
Roadstead	21,799	84,593
Outer Harbour (Breakwater)	45,786	5,552
	124,327	24,528
Inner Harbour	15,648	23,734
	70,356	23,476
	277,916	161,883
Average for year	138,958	80,942

NOTE.—Figures given by Napier Chamber of Commerce show this average as Tons. 140,005 Tons. 87,826

Average Total Imports and Exports.—Per exhibits Nos. 37, 38, 39, 62, 63, 219,900 tons; per Napier Chamber of Commerce (pages 450–453), 227,831 tons; per Local Authorities Handbook, 1927 (page 380), 221,653 tons.

Population served (page 450, Notes of Evidence) is 87,742: equals from 2·5 to 2·6 tons per head.

Adopting the population as given by the Government Statistician in Exhibit No. 151, and the total cargo handled as given by the Local Authorities Handbook, 1927, page 380, the following comparison can be made :—

Port.	Population per Government Statistician.	Cargo handled : Imports and Exports of Population.	Tons per Head.
		Tons.	
Napier	75,760	221,653	From 2·5 to 2·6
Dunedin	128,575	426,552	3·3
Lyttelton	181,900	697,971	3·83

(8) GENERAL.

Hawke's Bay and the adjoining territory is an exceptionally fine producing area for wool and meat. Dairying and fruitgrowing are quite successful in certain localities, but the province is pre-eminently wool and meat country, and commercially and industrially speaking is organized and operated on that basis. Climatic and physical conditions, particularly the occasional recurrence of dry years, militate against the successful working of small agricultural holdings except in certain favoured localities, and in view of this, and of the fairly staple prospects for wool and meat in the world's markets, it is reasonable to assume that in Hawke's Bay and the adjoining districts served by the Napier Harbour wool and meat will remain the dominant factors for years to come. Unfortunately, grazing and stock-rearing in such country, no matter how productive, does not call for anything like the same labour as agriculture or dairying in an area of the same size, therefore a rapid increase in population in the near future cannot be reasonably expected. Nevertheless, it is a fair assumption that with improved methods in stock-raising, increased productivity from the use of fertilizers, better grassing of pasture-lands, and the gradual subdivision of such of the larger holdings as are suitable for subdivision, a steady increase in production and in exports may be looked for. This, together with increased fruitgrowing and dairying in suitable localities, will lead gradually to a corresponding increase in population, and, as imports depend on exports and on the maintenance of a satisfactory standard of comfort, it is reasonable to assume that imports as well as exports will show a gradually rising tendency in the future. It must be remembered, however, that the purchasing-power of the community regulates imports, and this depends to a large extent on the *value* of exports, which in the case of wool and meat is in turn dependent on the course of the world's markets. It is conceivable, therefore, that a steadily increasing volume of exports might *not* produce an equivalent increase in the volume of imports. Given normal conditions, however, the future trade of the port should show a steady although not a rapid increase in volume.

(9) ECONOMIC CONCLUSION.

Amongst the main ports of the Dominion, Napier ranks fourth in outwards and fifth in inwards tonnage. The volume of trade has been fairly well handled in the past, and, in spite of the partially developed state of the harbour, there is very little evidence of undue delay in handling either exports or imports, and even at the height of the wool season steamer-loading in the roadstead has apparently been very prompt. As regards the Breakwater Harbour, there has been little delay or loss of time, either on account of weather conditions or because of insufficient wharf and railway facilities. It also appears that the present arrangements in respect to harbour and roadstead loading and discharge are sufficiently capable of expansion to take care of any gradual increase in trade for some years to come. Certain minor improvements in railway and sorting-shed accommodation are necessary, but on the whole the trade of the port has been carried on very efficiently, and the Harbour Board staff, and the shipping, stevedoring, and lightering companies and their employees are to be congratulated on the prompt and careful despatch given, especially to roadstead cargo, all of which requires double handling. It would no doubt be desirable to eliminate this double handling with all that it involves in labour and lighterage, but the port is certainly being effectively, although somewhat expensively, worked under present conditions, and can continue to be so worked for some considerable time to come. While, therefore, a change to more modern and economic methods is desirable, it is not immediately essential, and the heavy expenditure entailed by such a change cannot be justified on the ground of necessity, either from the present or the immediate trade future.

The question of whether the expenditure referred to would be justifiable from the financial aspect necessitates a careful examination of the financial position and resources of the Board and of the Hawke's Bay Rating District.

(10) ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL POSITION.

In order to determine intelligently the present position, and the financial potentialities of the more immediate future, it is necessary to examine briefly assets and liabilities, revenue and expenditure, essential works either in progress or contemplated, also sources of income, and any other important factors relevant to financial issues, including the present capital costs of all harbour-works.

Assets.

Napier Harbour fixed assets and improvements consist of (a) the Inner Harbour and the Outer or Breakwater Harbour, with the accompanying wharves, sheds, and other facilities; (b) a railway-line of about 117 chains connecting the Outer Harbour with the New Zealand railway terminus at Port Ahuriri, together with engines and rolling-stock; (c) certain somewhat ancient dredges, and other harbour plant, stores, and materials, including a considerable stock of concrete piles, beach protective works, and office buildings and equipment. In addition to these harbour assets proper there is (d) real estate of various values, consisting of reclaimed lands and endowments vested in the Harbour Board. The particulars supplied on the last statement of the Board's accounts issued 30th September, 1926, page 20, and on the estimate for the current year ending 30th September, 1927, attached, may be summarized as follows:—

				(11) FIXED ASSETS.	1926 Valuation. £	1927 Valuation. £
Plant, buildings, and railway	41,352	40,915
Inner Harbour works	49,404	57,657
Outer Harbour works	258,041	255,075
Beach protection, stores, piles, &c.	28,102	24,243
Land	376,899	377,890
Reclamations and endowments	257,728	254,830
Totals	£634,627	£632,720

(12) CASH ASSETS.

The following statement shows the cash assets held at the close of the same periods:—

				Nine Months to 30th September, 1926. £	Twelve Months to 30th September, 1927 (estimated). £
Fixed deposits	70,000	69,600 (loan-money)
Cash	622	3,500
Investments	300	300
Sundry debtors	16,925	16,680 (rates, rents, dues, &c.)
War Relief Fund investment	912	930
Sinking Fund investment	105,252	114,400
Cash assets	194,011	205,410
Fixed assets (above)	634,627	632,720
Total assets	£828,638	£838,130

(13) LIABILITIES.

The liabilities on the above dates are shown as under:—

				At 30th September, 1926. £	At 30th September, 1927 (estimated). £
Loans	656,900	656,900
Overdraft	8,923	10,348
Sundry creditors	4,486	4,510
Unredeemed debentures	100	100
Deposits	345	171
				£670,754	£672,029

(14) LOANS AND CONTINGENT LIABILITIES.

The outstanding features in regard to loans and contingent liabilities are the commitments for *loan renewals and contracts for works* at present in progress.

On the 1st January, 1928, loans Nos. 3, 5, 6, and 7, amounting to £446,000, will mature, which, less the estimated sinking funds in hand on that date, will necessitate the renewal of, say, £335,000 as per schedule attached (Exhibit 158). The loan indebtedness will then be as follows: Conversion loan, £335,000 (as above mentioned); No. 8 loan, £197,100 (Inner Harbour loan); No. 9 loan, £13,800 (repayment previous liability); Total loan debt as on 1st January, 1928, £545,900.

Out of No. 8 loan a sum of £69,600 has not yet been expended, but is held on deposit pending prosecution of works connected with the Inner Harbour. The liability in respect to these works is £37,884, or, if certain works should be completed in concrete instead of stone, £52,757.

Against the total estimated indebtedness of £545,900 an amount of £6,347 will have accrued in sinking fund by the 30th September, 1927, which leaves the net debt after the above-mentioned renewals have been effected at about £539,000.

(15) ESSENTIAL WORKS IN PROGRESS OR CONTEMPLATED.

The following schedule sets forth the various items which require to be undertaken at both the Inner and Outer Harbours in order to bring the port into a state of reasonable efficiency:—

Schedule of Works: Inner and Outer Harbours, &c.

(16) INNER HARBOUR.

(a) Eastern mole (in progress)	£14,084 (payable out of loan).
(b) Western mole (contemplated)	8,500 (payable out of loan).
(c) West Quay (in progress)	15,300 (presumably out of loan).
(d) J.D.O. dredge boiler (contemplated)	1,000 (proportion only).

£38,884

(If first two items in concrete add £14,873, making £53,757.)

(17) OUTER HARBOUR.

(e) Breakwater apron (contemplated)	£1,500
(f) Railway material (contemplated)	595
(g) E shed—addition, 70 ft. (contemplated)	1,250
(h) Electric runway (contemplated)	400
(d) J.D.O. dredge boiler (proportion only)	1,500
				£5,245
(Inner Harbour—above)	38,884
Total expenditure required to secure efficiency	£44,129

(18) WORKS IN PROGRESS.

Works in progress include (a) the contract for repairing and extending by 120 ft. the eastern mole at the Inner Harbour. Contract price plus engineering expenses is, if in stone, £14,084; if in concrete, £23,957. The other work in progress is (c) West Quay reconstruction: this is nominally being paid for out of revenue, but as the estimated receipts for the year ending 30th September, 1927, will probably fall short of the estimated expenditure by £930, the work which is being done on West Quay will probably have to be paid out of overdraft, and may have to be recouped eventually from loan-money.

(19) WORKS CONTEMPLATED.

These works (b, d, e, f, g, and h) are set forth in the foregoing schedule, and it is to be noted that the expenditure of £1,500 (e) for concrete blocks for the breakwater is urgently required, whilst another item that might be described as an urgent call is (d) for a new boiler for the J.D.O. dredge, estimated to cost about £2,500. In addition to these two items, it will be necessary to provide a certain amount of railway material, principally rails and sleepers, (f) £595, and to make an addition of 70 ft. to the E sorting-shed, estimated to cost (g) £1,250, together with an electric runway in the shed (h) £400. When these works at the Inner and Outer Harbour and on the railway have been carried out, together with the provision of a new boiler for the J.D.O. dredge, the harbour-works will have been brought into a reasonable state of working efficiency, and the subsequent maintenance charges should be materially reduced.

(20) GLASGOW WHARF.

Repairs and reinstatements to this wharf have been in progress for some time. The Resident Engineer, Mr. George Huntley, reported to the Board on the 1st September, 1924, that the cost of repairing the timberwork of the Glasgow and Breakwater Wharves would amount to £5,848, and stated that if the repairs outlined by him were carried out it should not be necessary to spend more on the maintenance of these wharves for a number of years. These repairs have been in progress for some time, and the Glasgow Wharf is now in much better condition than it has been; but according to the evidence of Mr. J. P. Kenny, the Secretary, a further sum of £3,000 per annum requires to be expended for the next three years before the wharf can be said to be in a really good condition. It is proposed to carry on this work, the cost of same being paid for out of the revenue.

(21) REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

The following is a synopsis of revenue and expenditure (including depreciation) for the under-noted periods. The two last are of course, estimates, that for the twelve months ending the 30th September, 1927, being practically accurate, as the actual figures were available up to 31st July:—

	Revenue.	Expenditure.	Deficit.
	£	£	£
Nine months to 30th September, 1926	74,539	82,627	8,088
Twelve months to 30th September, 1927	97,251	98,201	950
Twelve months to 30th September, 1928	104,058	95,783	Surplus 8,275

The salient features are the excess of expenditure for the twenty-one months ending 30th September, 1927, and the estimated surplus for the twelve months ending the 30th September, 1928. Apart from interest on fixed deposits and sundry small items of revenue, the main sources of income are: Harbour revenue, rentals from reclaimed land and endowments, and rates; while expenditure is summarized under the headings of interest and sinking-fund charges, departmental expenses, plant, harbour-works, reclamation, depreciation, and sundries.

The following analysis of the revenue and expenditure for the three periods under review illustrates the movement, actual and estimated, of the various items of account:—

(22) REVENUE.

	Harbour Revenue.	Rentals.	Rates.	Interest.	Sundries.
	£	£	£	£	£
1926 (nine months)	51,145	5,998	14,731	2,412	252
1927 (estimated)	71,198	7,960	14,693	2,999	400
1928 (estimated)	78,708	8,000	14,750	2,200	400

(23) EXPENDITURE.

	Interest and Sinking Fund.	Departmental.	Plant.	Harbour-works.	Reclamation.	Depreciation.	Sundry.
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1926 (nine months)	39,081	16,509	2,844	10,997	1,225	6,555	5,416
1927 (estimated)	41,413	23,410	4,844	7,452	3,400	9,843	7,837
1928 (estimated)	37,058	27,065	4,950	8,500	1,350	7,780	9,080

(24) COMMENTS ON REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE.

Owing to the change in the date of the financial year in accordance with the provisions of the Harbours Act, the accounts as closed on the 30th September, 1926, only cover a period of nine months. It is therefore impracticable, except by means of complicated calculations, to compare that period with succeeding years, and for purposes of comparison the estimates for the years 1927 and 1928 may be assumed to be sufficiently accurate. An analysis of these estimates shows a considerable movement under the various headings. Harbour revenue gives an increase of £7,510 for 1928, partly as the result of the operation of the new scale of dues and charges, and partly from the anticipated increase in trade. Interest on deposits, on the other hand, shows a decrease of £799, owing to the shrinkage in the amount of fixed deposits, due to the expenditure of loan-moneys. The other items—rentals, rates, and sundries—show little or no change. The net increase in revenue on the estimate of 1928 as compared with 1927 is £6,808.

On the expenditure side a considerable movement is foreshadowed during 1928 as against 1927. Interest and sinking-fund payments show a welcome decrease of £4,355, the result of the repayment of the loans maturing on the 1st January, 1928 (paragraph 14). Reclamation expenditure is lower by £2,050 and depreciation is less by £2,063 than in the preceding twelve months, largely owing to harbour-works and plant being brought into a better state of repair. These three decreases in expenditure total £8,468. On the other hand, department expenditure shows an increase of £3,655. This is largely due to the special expenses in connection with exchange and commission which will be incurred in paying off the loans maturing and arranging renewals of loan-money (paragraph 14).

Harbour-works are expected to increase by £1,048, and plant by £106, due to special repairs and replacements already referred to; and sundries will show an anticipated increase of £1,243 in comparison with 1927, owing to provision for cost of the present Commission of Inquiry. The increase in expenditure in department expenses, works, plant, and sundries for 1928 as against 1927 is £6,052, which deducted from the decrease of £8,468 in interest, reclamation, and depreciation shows a net decrease for the period of £2,416. This net decrease in expenditure, plus the net increase in revenue, makes up a total of £9,224, which, less the estimated loss of £950 in 1927, gives a surplus for 1928 estimated at £8,274.

(25) The general movement of revenue and expenditure is therefore apparently in the right direction, and *provided always* that the estimates for 1928 in regard to increased harbour revenue are reliable, the indications are that after the present repairs and replacements have been carried out and the harbour put into a good working condition, the Board (after providing for depreciation, and the usual maintenance charges on plant and harbour works, and the ordinary cost of administration) may in future look forward to an annual surplus.

(26) These annual surpluses should be devoted to building up reserve funds, available for further harbour-development. It is also recommended that the amount charged against revenue each year for depreciation of plant be represented by an actual fund, created by taking an equivalent amount out of cash each year and specially investing it. This is precisely what is done with the annual charge for Sinking Fund, and the reason is precisely the same. That reason is that if this course is

not adopted the amount charged against revenue becomes merged in the general assets and resources of the Board, and is therefore not available in ready cash when required to buy new plant or repay a loan, as the case may be. When the annual amount is invested as we suggest, a fund of ear-marked cash is available when new plant is required (Plant Depreciation Fund) or a loan falls due (Sinking Fund). These contingencies can then be met to the extent to which these funds exist, without having recourse to further borrowing or without embarrassing the financial period in which the new plant is required.

(27) SOURCES OF REVENUE.

These are not particularly elastic. Wharfage charges, dues on ships, rentals from land, rates for harbour-improvement loans, have been exploited to the fullest extent, and, beyond the natural increase which may be expected from the general development of trade and settlement, it is difficult to see where any further improvement in revenue is to come from. The following is a brief examination of the various sources of revenue.

(28) WHARFAGE (PAYABLE BY EXPORTERS AND IMPORTERS).

The Napier charges are already so high that they compare most unfavourably with Wellington, which is the nearest competing port, and any further advance would not only penalize consignees and consignors, but would tend to drive trade to other shipping-points, and so react most unfavourably on the volume of trade handled at Napier.

(29) A brief comparison illustrates the difference on some of the principal lines:—

Outwards—	Napier.		Wellington.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.
Mutton (per ton)	4	9	0	9
Lamb (per ton)	4	8	0	9
Wool (per bale)	1	8	0	7
Tallow (per ton)	3	9	1	3
Inwards—				
General goods (per ton, including labour)	4	0	4	0

(30) The estimates of harbour revenue for the years ending the 30th September, 1927 and 1928, include the following items as receipts from the Wharfage Department—1927, £58,209; 1928, £64,844—showing an estimated increase of £6,635 for wharfage. These estimates are based on the assumption that the present class of trade will continue at each harbour, and that the new berthage rates will not have the effect of causing certain overseas vessels, which have been in the habit of using the breakwater, to discharge in the roadstead, or to tranship their cargo at other ports. The estimates also anticipate a reasonable increase in the volume of trade.

(31) CHARGES AND DUES (PAYABLE BY SHIPOWNERS).

Changes were made in the berthage rates on the 1st July, 1927. These changes do not appear to produce very much more revenue in the aggregate than formerly, as will be seen from the supplement to Exhibit No. 41; but the result of the incidence of the charge calculated at per ton of cargo is to place the Outer Harbour in a less favourable position than the Inner Harbour from the shipowners point of view. The relative figures are:—

	Cost per Ton of Cargo landed or shipped.	
	Old Scale.	New Scale.
Outer Harbour	d. 5·24	d. 9·36
Inner Harbour	7·94	3·8

In the estimates of harbour revenue referred to in the previous paragraph the following items are included as showing receipts from the Harbour Department—1927, £12,989; 1928, £13,864—showing an estimated increase of £875 for 1928. If this charge is equitably spread over the total number of vessels using the port it does not appear likely to have any great adverse effect.

(32) RENTALS FROM LAND.

There is no doubt that ultimately the Napier Harbour Board will receive a very handsome income from this source. In 1902 the rentals received totalled £1,376, while in 1927 an income of £7,960 is anticipated from the same source. Unfortunately, however, the rental income seems to be comparatively stationary at present, and for the year 1928 is only expected to reach a net amount of about £3,000. Until further areas are reclaimed, subdivided, and leased, only a small increase from this source may be expected. The problem of reclamation will be fully dealt with separately, so that it is not necessary to enlarge upon this subject at present, beyond saying that for some considerable time it is apparent that no great assistance towards the Board's revenue can be reasonably expected from this source.

(33) RATES.

Hawke's Bay is a rating-area in connection with harbour loans, and the ratepayers in this way contributed £14,693 in 1927, and they are expected to supply a similar amount in 1928. The policy of the Board is, rightly, in the direction of reducing rates whenever possible, and in view of the burdens carried by both town and country ratepayers throughout the province it cannot be suggested that any advance in rates would be either wise or practicable.

(34) HARBOUR-IMPROVEMENT RATE.

This is a source of income which has been tried and abandoned, as it was found that the charge was passed on by the owners of the vessels to the owners of goods. It might be possible to impose a charge on imports, as is done in Wellington; but the province is already so heavily taxed, both directly and indirectly, for harbour facilities that the imposition of a harbour-improvement rate should only be resorted to as a last resource.

(35) ROADSTEAD CARGO AND LIGHTERAGE.

The question of roadstead loading and discharge for large overseas vessels, with the consequent burden of lighterage and double handling of cargo, is so important and so vital that it must be considered in any complete survey of the economic and financial position of Napier Harbour. At present nearly the whole of the wool and meat which is shipped at the Port of Napier is lightered to vessels in the roadstead, besides a good deal of general outwards cargo. A large quantity of inwards cargo is also handled in this way. The following return for the past two years supplies fuller particulars :—

	Cargo lightered.	
	Twelve Months ending 31st March, 1926.	Twelve Months ending 31st March, 1927.
General cargo inwards (tons)	13,880	9,120
General cargo outwards (tons)	4,277	4,077
Meat (tons)	18,450	18,748
Totals	36,697	31,945
Wool and hemp (bales)	81,696	89,535

(36) Evidence shows that the arrangements in respect to lightering are good and efficient. Several experienced witnesses affirmed that the loading and discharge of overseas steamers in the roadstead was as prompt, or nearly as prompt, as if the vessels had been working at a wharf; and, while this point is debatable, there is no doubt that lightering at Napier is an essential link under present conditions between land transport and sea transport, and that it is a public utility which is very effectively operated by private enterprise. The annual charge for lighterage amounts to about £30,000 per annum, and under the existing conditions, and in view of the services rendered, it does not appear that the charge is unduly heavy, or that the lightering company is extracting an undue profit. There is no doubt, however, that the annual cost of lightering is borne either directly or indirectly by the population of Hawke's Bay and surrounding districts, and the possibility of eliminating this annual expenditure of £30,000 has constituted a very potent although somewhat misleading argument in the endeavours which have been made from time to time to induce the public to endorse plans for harbour-development.

(36A) ANNUAL REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Our summary of the results of the revenue transactions of the Board for the period to the 30th September, 1926, and (estimated) for the year 1926-27 cannot be reconciled with the statement of the Chairman of the Board that, in addition to ordinary expenditure, the Board was out of revenue spending large sums on quay-construction and reclamation, and would even then finish up with a substantial surplus. (See Notes of Evidence, page 41.) The Chairman's statement is incorrect; he has fallen into the error of trying to ascertain the result of the year's working by reference to the cash-book only, without making all the adjustments necessary to eliminate items that do not relate to the year's revenue transactions. These include cash received on sale of capital assets; cash collected during the year as realization of last year's revenue, outstanding last balance-day; cash paid during the year in liquidation of last year's expenses, outstanding last balance-day. On the other hand, there must be added to the records contained in the cash-book the amount (a) of revenue belonging to the period but not yet collected; and (b) expenditure properly chargeable to the year's revenue accounts but not paid at balance-day; (c) the amount by which the working assets have depreciated during the period. All these adjustments have been properly and correctly made by the Secretary (including every penny of relevant items appearing in the cash-book), and the result appears on page 17 of the Board's published accounts for the nine months ended 30th September, 1926, under the heading, "Statement of Income and Expenditure for the Period 1st January, 1926, to 30th

September, 1926." The result is a deficiency of £8,087 for the period. The corresponding statement for the year ending 30th September, 1927, shows a deficiency of £950.

The Harbours Amendment Act, 1925, by section 4, makes the preparation and publication of a statement of income and expenditure for the year compulsory for the future. This is an excellent provision, and should make misleading errors of the above description more difficult and less excusable.

(37) CAPITAL COST OF HARBOUR-WORKS.

The instruction in the order of reference to "take into account the amount already expended" necessitates some inquiry in the cost of both the Inner Harbour and the Breakwater.

Inner Harbour.

Exhibit No. 161 shows (a) capital expended on the Inner Harbour up to and including 1884, when the breakwater was initiated; (b) capital expenditure on the Inner Harbour from 1885 to 1909 inclusive, or what may be termed the breakwater era; (c) capital expended on the Inner Harbour from 1909 to 1927, the Inner Harbour era: total expenditure, £270,468.

Outer (or Breakwater) Harbour.

The same exhibit shows (d) capital expenditure on the Outer Harbour from 1885 to 1909 inclusive; (e) capital expenditure from 1909 to 1927; total expenditure, £448,707.

(38) SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURE.

Inner Harbour—				£
(a)	Up to and including 1884	75,000
(b)	From 1885 to 1909 inclusive	2,730
(c)	From 1910 to 31st July, 1927	192,738
				£270,468
Breakwater Harbour—				£
(d)	1885 to 1909	443,840
(e)	1910 to 31st July, 1927	4,867
				£448,707

(39) VALUATION OF HARBOURS.

The valuation of the respective works for 1926 and 1927, and the estimated valuation for 1928, are given as follows:—

	1926 Valuation.	1927 Valuation.	1928 Estimated Valuation.
	£	£	£
Inner Harbour works	49,404	57,657	78,431
Outer Harbour works	258,041	255,075	252,165

(40) INNER HARBOUR LOAN EXPENDITURE.

Out of No. 6 and No. 8 loans (amounting to £247,100) a sum of £175,135 had been expended on Inner Harbour works up to the 30th September, 1926, and further expenditure on the Eastern Mole contract and Western Quay reconstruction has been going on since, while the Western Mole has still to be made good, so that by the 30th September, 1928, the total expenditure out of this loan-money will probably amount to £213,000.

Of the sum of £175,134 already spent, one item of £84,348 is the contribution of the Napier Harbour Board towards the cost of the Inner Harbour and East Coast Railway embankment. This money was spent in anticipation of the completion of the Inner Harbour scheme. The original intention of the Board was that their contribution should not exceed £50,000, but for various reasons which need not be recapitulated here the original estimate was much exceeded. Failing the development of the Inner Harbour as a deep-sea port, this sum of £84,348 is of no practical advantage or benefit to the Napier Harbour, and, as the Board is not treating it as an asset, it has practically been written off, and may be looked upon for Harbour Board purposes as unproductive capital expenditure not represented by any available asset.

Another item of capital expenditure which is at present a "frozen" asset, is the unduly large stock of concrete piles in hand. These piles were manufactured in anticipation of the development of the Inner Harbour, and, while they are being used up at the rate of about £5,000 worth per annum, the quantity on hand is very much in excess of immediate requirements and represents a capital investment which cannot be turned to any practical account in the near future, although there is no reason to suggest that the Board will not eventually be able to make good use of them. The same remarks apply to a lesser degree to stocks of steel and iron work on hand for the purpose of manufacturing further supplies of piles, &c.

(41) The present position is, therefore, that out of the sum of £247,100 borrowed in order to develop the Inner Harbour, a sum of £84,348 has already been, in effect, written off, and can be of no benefit if the Inner Harbour scheme is jettisoned; whilst at least £10,000 more is lying idle in the shape of piles and other materials, which can only be utilized by slow degrees. Fortunately, the balance of the loan-money has been profitably and usefully expended in putting the existing Inner Harbour works into good condition. Mr. Mackenzie has prepared an estimate of cost of completion, and this appears as Table G in the appendix.

(42) OUTER HARBOUR LOAN EXPENDITURE.

The capital expenditure of £448,707 has been written down to about £255,000 in 1927, and will have been further written down to about £252,165 by 1928. Fortunately, there is no dead capital item to criticize in connection with the Breakwater Harbour. Successive Boards since 1909 have apparently pursued a cheeseparing policy in regard to the Breakwater Harbour, which has evidently been looked upon rather as an adjunct to the Inner Harbour than anything else. In consequence the breakwater itself has been to some extent starved, while the Glasgow Wharf had at one time been allowed to get into a state of disrepair approaching danger-point. (See Exhibit No. 93.) These defects have been remedied to some extent, but expenditure in respect to the Outer Harbour has never been lavish. The result is that there are no dead assets to comment on in connection with that scheme. On the other hand, there is a capital investment in good, useful harbour-works, which at present-day valuation stands at £255,000. These works, with the expenditure of perhaps £450,000 more, are capable at some future date of being converted into a satisfactory harbour for overseas vessels, and, taking all circumstances of the case into consideration, it is therefore essential that the breakwater, with the wharves and other facilities pertaining thereto, should be maintained in good and efficient working-condition, with a view to expansion when commercial and financial circumstances so warrant.

Mr. A. C. Mackenzie has prepared an estimate of the cost of completion of Breakwater Harbour, and this appears as Table H in the appendix.

(43) FINANCIAL CONCLUSION.

In view of the present financial position of the assets and liabilities and of the revenue and expenditure of the Napier Harbour Board, in conjunction with the capital costs of the present works and the probable expenditure necessary to bring these works into a state of efficiency, together with the important fact that none of the present sources of income are capable of producing any marked increase of revenue in the near future, it is evident that the Napier Harbour Board and the Hawke's Bay Rating District are in no condition to shoulder any further financial burden at present. It has been stated that the increased rentals to be obtained by reclaiming further areas of land would compensate for increased harbour expenditure, but a full exploration of this source of income, which will be dealt with separately, does not disclose any grounds for such optimism. Therefore it can be said without hesitation that the heavy expenditure required by a complete scheme of harbour development is not justifiable from the financial aspect.

SUMMARY OF COMMERCIAL AND ECONOMIC REPORT.

(44) In reply to Question No. 1C—"Whether the expenditure of the money necessary to construct such a harbour (as referred to in the replies to Questions 1A and 1B), taking into account the amount already expended, can be justified from the financial and economic aspect"—and referring to the details furnished in the foregoing pages, and more particularly to paragraphs 8 and 42, we beg to summarize as follows:—

(45) In view of the fact that no rapid increase may be anticipated in the trade of the port, and that the corresponding revenue will only grow slowly, and, furthermore, that both inwards and outwards tonnage is being handled and can be handled effectively under existing conditions, there is no urgent necessity for the people of Hawke's Bay to rush into a further borrowing policy and a large expenditure on harbour development. Such a policy, entailing the raising of perhaps £450,000 and resulting in an addition to the present bill for interest and sinking fund of a further £27,000 per annum, could only be justified if some very considerable advantage, either financial or commercial, were to be gained.

(46) In time past the saving of lighterage has been held out as a compensating advantage in order to justify the expenditure required to provide an up-to-date harbour, but it will be apparent on reflection that no real saving could be effected in this way. The people of the Harbour rating area who are now paying £30,000 per annum for lighterage would merely be exchanging that burden for a similar burden in the shape of interest and sinking fund. The incidence of the burden would be shifted, but the community would in the long-run be no better off.

(47) From an economic and commercial point of view the time has not yet arrived for harbour development, no matter how desirable it may appear to provide an enclosed harbour and wharf loading for overseas ships, and the Harbour Board and the people of Hawke's Bay will therefore do well to proceed quietly on present lines for perhaps ten or even fifteen years before they even consider seriously the launching of a complete harbour-development scheme. In the meantime every effort should be made to carry on with economy, to inaugurate a prudent and helpful reclamation scheme, to reduce harbour charges and rates wherever such reduction is possible, and at the same time to build up reserve funds, so that when the production of the province and the trade of the port has sufficiently increased the Board may be in a sound financial position to undertake a carefully considered scheme of harbour development.

PART 15. SHOULD THE INNER HARBOUR LEGISLATION OF 1914 BE REVOKED ?

Our order of reference, after submitting seven specific questions to us, requires us generally to inquire into and report upon the premises, and any matters arising thereout which may come under our notice in the course of our inquiries and which we consider should be investigated in connection therewith.

Prior to the setting-out of the seven questions referred to a number of matters are premised in the form of recitals, and are therefore the premises into which we are to inquire and upon which we are to report. One of these recitals appears in the following words: "Whereas by the Napier Harbour Board Empowering and Loan Act, 1914, the Board was, subject to the provisions of the Harbours Act, 1908, and of the said Act of 1914, duly authorized to construct such harbour-works as should by the Board be considered necessary for the requirements of the Harbour of Napier in and about the construction, completion, development, and improvement of the Inner Harbour portion of the said harbour. . . . And whereas it appears to the Government that it is expedient to appoint a Commission to make inquiry into and report regarding the question as to whether the authority to construct wholly or in part the works specified in the Napier Harbour Board Empowering and Loan Act, 1914, should be continued in force and the work authorized in due course, or whether legislation should be enacted to revoke the said authority wholly or in part. . . ." The works specified in the Napier Harbour Board Empowering and Loan Act, 1914 (which we shall hereafter refer to as "the said Act") comprise, firstly, the construction, completion, and development of the Inner Harbour; secondly, the repair and renewal of certain parts of the existing Inner Harbour; and, thirdly, certain reclamation works; and these authorities are contained respectively in sections 7, 8, and 14.

The whole question of reclamation and our recommendations in relation thereto will be found contained in Part 18 of this report. We propose now to give attention to the question of whether or not the authority to construct wholly or in part the work specified in sections 7 and 8 of the said Act should be continued in force and the work authorized in due course, or legislation should be enacted to revoke the said authority.

We have in earlier portions of this report, in answer to certain of Your Excellency's specific questions, answered that in our opinion the Inner Harbour scheme of the Napier Harbour Board was not the best and most suitable harbour from an engineering, navigational, and economic point of view, and further, that, in our opinion, the expenditure of further sums of money on harbour development at Napier cannot be justified from the financial and economic aspect.

We are of opinion that it follows as a logical sequel to these answers that the authority contained in section 7 of the said Act should be revoked. We are further of opinion that the expenditure of any sums that have so far been spent in the exercise of the powers thereby created should be ratified and validated notwithstanding the revocation of the said authority. Of the sum which the 1914 Act authorized to be raised — viz., £300,000 — the Harbour Board has raised in all £247,100, leaving unborrowed the sum of £52,900, and we recommend that the authority to borrow that sum be revoked. Of the sum of £247,100, the sum of £175,135 had been expended up to the 30th September, 1926, leaving at that date a sum of £71,965 unexpended.

The Board had entered into certain undertakings for renewal and extension of its existing wharf facilities at the Inner Harbour, and the reconstruction of the eastern and western moles at the entrance channel to that harbour, at an estimated cost of £37,884. We also recommend in Part 16 hereof that the sum of £3,745 be expended upon putting the existing works at the Breakwater Harbour in a state of good repair and efficiency; also that £2,500 be spent on a new boiler for the Board's dredge J.D.O. These works total £44,129 (see Exhibits Nos. 96 and 97). This sum expended out of the above balance of £71,965 leaves loan-moneys in hand £27,836, less probably some portion of the loan-money spent since the 30th September, 1926, not included in the above repair and renewal items. We recommend that the Board be authorized to expend the said loan-moneys in hand on the said repair and replacement works, and that the balance be invested as a Reserve Fund available for future harbour-works when authorized.

As to the power to expend £50,000 on certain repairs and renewals bestowed by the proviso to section 8 of the said Act, the position is that these powers have been exercised and exhausted, and no recommendation is necessary. On page 17 of our report will be found a table of expenditure showing the details of the expenditure of the whole of the £50,000 authorized to be raised by the said proviso to section 8. This sum of £50,000 is included in the sum of £175,135 mentioned above as having been expended.

The Chairman of the Harbour Board, Mr. A. E. Jull, when giving evidence, referred to the matter of the Commission being asked to make a recommendation on the present subject-matter. Mr. Jull said (see page 42, Notes of Evidence), "It must be remembered that any proposal to repeal legislation authorizing a local authority to do certain work, particularly when that local authority have had the acquiescence of the people, who will be called upon to become responsible for that expenditure—that such a suggestion is, as far as I know, without precedent in this country, and will evoke, I undertake to say, violent opposition from all local authorities in the country, as it would mean practically a substitution of bureaucratic control for local Government."

We cannot see that any such principle as is urged by Mr. Jull is at stake. Parliament in good faith, acting on certain information, gave the power. If Parliament follows our recommendation it will, equally in good faith, and, we submit confidently, on later and much more accurate information, revoke the authority. To our minds the proposition is self-evident that any legislating assembly may and should do so, and we do not propose to labour the point. We do, however, suggest that if the constituents of the Harbour Board are in any way aggrieved, and if the correction of an original mistake proves expensive, the blame would lie neither at the door of the Legislature which originally gave and subsequently revoked the authority, nor at the door of this Commission, which honestly and confidently recommended the repeal of the legislation in question, but at the door of those persons whose actions and words had led their constituents to become supporters of an unsound proposal. If our recommendation to repeal the legislative authority in question is without precedent in this country, we are prepared to stand by it as a better precedent than many that stand crystallized in the form of unjustifiable and unproductive monuments to the unwise expenditure of public money.

PART 16.—ADVISABILITY OF CONSTRUCTING HARBOUR.

The next question submitted is, "Whether, taking into account all relevant considerations, it is advisable that such a harbour be constructed?" We define "constructed" in this connection as meaning "completed or developed." We have in the immediately preceding paragraph answered that the expenditure of the money necessary to construct the recommended harbour cannot be justified from the financial and economic point of view. We know of no aspects of the whole problem that dominate the financial and economic aspects, and we are therefore of opinion that our answer to this question follows as a matter of course on that given to the immediately preceding question. Our answer is that it is not advisable that such a harbour be constructed now or in the immediate future.

PART 17.—IS THERE ANY ALTERNATIVE SCHEME?

The next question to which we must address ourselves is in the following words: "In view of all the circumstances, is there any other scheme which you can recommend in preference to those mentioned and compared in Part 12 hereof—viz., a completed Inner Harbour scheme or a completed breakwater scheme?"

It seems to us that there are two ways in which we may interpret this question. One way would be to consider the evidence with a view to answering the question, "Is there any harbour scheme quite distinct from the breakwater or Inner Harbour schemes which is worth consideration and can be put forward for recommendation?" A bare reference was made, for instance, on one or two occasions in the course of the evidence to a deep-sea harbour site near Cape Kidnappers; whilst further brief references were made to an Inner Harbour quite distinct from that which we have discussed in our foregoing paragraphs, in that its entrance channel, as to direction and other details, was quite different from that recommended by Messrs. Cullen and Keele. We may briefly dismiss this possible aspect of the question. No such scheme is at the present time so seriously before the Napier Harbour Board or the ratepayers of that Harbour Board's district as to be considered within the scheme of practical politics; we collected no evidence designed to lead to a conclusion on any such scheme, and we answer that from this point of view we have no recommendation to make.

The question, however, is capable of a second interpretation, which may be stated thus: "Has the Commission any recommendation which it can put forward as an alternative to constructing a complete Breakwater Harbour at the present time?" or, in other words, seeing that the Commission has advised that the construction of the recommended Harbour is not justifiable financially or economically, does the Commission recommend that the harbour district and its elected representatives do nothing?

Our answer to this question, in whichever form it may be taken, is that we recommend that the Harbour Board enter upon a policy of putting its existing facilities into a state of efficiency with a view to procuring the most effective service and the utmost returns from a composite harbour scheme, comprising a roadstead for the largest vessels, the breakwater harbour for such large vessels as require its use, and the Inner Harbour for vessels drawing up to 15 ft.

We are quite satisfied that it is nothing but the unfortunate intrusion of party spirit into the constitution and deliberations of the Board, resulting in a state of settled warfare between parties, that has led to the inner and breakwater portions of Napier Harbour facilities being pitted against each other as rival harbours. We are satisfied that common-sense, business insight, and experience of what is being done in harbour construction and administration in other parts of the world unite in pointing out the Inner and Breakwater Harbours as complementary parts of a comprehensive scheme of harbour operations. In our opinion, the present state of the harbour controversy, with local partisans holding the views that have been put before us with a fervour that may almost be described as fanatical, would be ludicrous if it had not been fraught with such unsatisfactory results to the people of the district.

The true issues have been very much clouded by the partisan spirit invoked, and by sectional aims and ambitions, but we are confident that the view we have here expressed is one which will appeal to any unbiased and intelligent observer who takes the trouble to make a careful examination of the present problem.

We are satisfied that the results of the party dispute which, particularly since the year 1909, has so strongly influenced the Board's policy have been to cloud the judgment of members of the Harbour Board, to clog their energies and divert them from useful deliberation, to cause them to allow harbour-works to fall into a state of quite serious disrepair and inefficiency, and to bring the valuable reclamation policy of the Board to a standstill. Furthermore, the evidence has raised in our minds more than a suspicion that there are aspects of the administrative side of the Board's work where inefficient methods and faulty organization have been tolerated and allowed to continue longer than they would have been had it not been that their existence and results tended to lend weight to some of the theories and claims of the dominant party on the Harbour Board at the time. In this connection we are satisfied that these tendencies have operated to the discouragement of a most efficient and loyal staff, the members of which seem nevertheless to have rendered excellent service to the Board. In support of the foregoing statements we would refer to the points which we have in mind—viz., the lack of maintenance work on the breakwater by the failure to supply renewal concrete blocks placed pell-mell at points that were becoming weakened; the serious state of disrepair at the Glasgow Wharf which has existed at times and which now seems to be amended only to the point of the minimum standard of safety; and, thirdly, the inefficient existing arrangements for loading and discharging general cargo at and from the Glasgow Wharf.

We recommend, therefore, that for the period of the next ten years the Harbour Board should, after having made a close and careful survey of its financial position, seek to consolidate that position. Time is necessary to disclose the effect of recent alterations in the tariff of harbour dues. It is quite apparent that for the current year and for some years past the annual revenue expenditure of the Board exceeds and has exceeded its income for the corresponding periods, and the whole system has therefore been run at an annual loss. It should, therefore, in our opinion, be the immediate financial concern of the Board to make up this leeway and bring out the result of its revenue operations on the correct side. It should as soon as possible undertake the work of putting the existing facilities in a state of good repair and efficiency.

We have obtained from the Secretary of the Harbour Board (see Exhibit No. 96) an estimate of the cost of putting the Inner Harbour into a state of good repair and reasonable efficiency for its present-day work. We have checked this carefully, and we believe that it is a good and reliable estimate. The Secretary brings the amount out at £39,000; the details of this are shown on Exhibit No. 96. We submitted the same question in relation to the Breakwater Harbour, and we were supplied with an estimate (Exhibit No. 97) prepared by the Secretary, showing the amount to be £5,300. We believe this to be an accurate and safe estimate. By the expenditure of these sums, and by devoting to the question of improving the industrial, mechanical, and administrative sides of the Board's work the energy which in the past has been dissipated in partisan warfare, we believe the Board can improve its revenue with its existing facilities, undertake a useful policy of reclamation, and thus build up reserves which will comparatively quickly put it in a position to consider a further constructive policy.

It is true that this policy will in the meantime leave the Napier Harbour with the necessity of using lighters for the bulk of its export trade. This is inevitable, however, and any disappointment that may arise therefrom is not due to our recommendation, which is made after fully considering all the facts, but must be laid at the door of those who in the past have made promises wholly incapable of fulfilment. The people of the district by printed pamphlets issued in 1920, when they were urged to sanction the loan for the Inner Harbour scheme, were invited to "Vote for Inner Harbour Loan . . . The harbour with no rates." In a summary of advantages printed on the same pamphlet the ratepayers were told that the Inner Harbour "would not cost the ratepayers one shilling"; that the land reclaimed alongside the shipping "will more than pay the total cost"; that "all shipping will gladly avail itself of the Inner Harbour; there will be no need to urge them to make use of it"; that "all the lighterage charges can be saved by a small expenditure of £250,000 on the Inner Harbour, and that land-rents will pay the interest." As against this the evidence satisfies us, and we believe that it will satisfy any intelligent ratepayer who will take the trouble to study it—(1) That in the financial period ending 30th September, 1926, after taking credit for rates, £14,731, the Harbour Board's outgoings exceeded its revenue for the period by £8,087; (2) that for the year ending 30th September, 1927, after taking credit for rates, £14,693, the year's working expenditure exceeds the year's revenue, according to the Secretary's estimate prepared at the end of August; (3) that the construction of the harbour would have involved an annual interest charge at least equivalent to the annual lighterage charge; (4) that for ten years to come, at least, the income from the reclaimed lands will produce little, if any, more than interest on the cost of reclamation; (5) that, at best, the Inner Harbour would have been a tidal basin into which only one overseas ship could pass either in or out at each slack water of high tide, and then only if favourable conditions existed at the mouth of the channel; whilst (6) at the worst, marine superintendents would forbid altogether the use of the Inner Harbour by their company's ships.

There is, therefore, little room to doubt that if the Inner Harbour were built in accordance with the Harbour Board's plans, the district would be required to carry (1) a considerable portion of the present cost of lighterage, (2) interest on the cost of construction of the harbour, (3) a heavy annual charge for maintenance dredging, and (4) the old burden of harbour rates. That part of our report which deals with "Reclamations" shows to what extent the harbour accounts may expect relief from rents from reclaimed lands.

PART 18.—INCIDENCE OF HARBOUR DUES.

Question No. 2 submitted to us by the order of reference is whether at the present time, according to the working of the existing law, the port dues, berthage dues, wharfing dues, charges for labour, charges on goods, and other charges which the Board is empowered to levy are imposed in a manner operating equitably as between different classes of ships, different parts of the harbour, and different classes of persons liable for payment of the said respective dues.

Some evidence was led before us touching recent changes in the rates of berthing dues and of the basis on which those rates were charged. The most recent alteration, which came into operation from the 1st July, 1927, imposes on all vessels other than lighters, a flat rate of 3d. per ton register per trip for the first day, and 1d. per ton register per trip for each day or part of a day after the first day. (See Exhibit No. 40.) For lighters the rate is 3d. per ton register per trip.

These were applied by witnesses to specific ships that habitually use the Napier Harbour, for the purpose of showing how, as compared with past rates, the charges tended to decrease the amount levied for berthage on smaller vessels and increase it on the larger vessels, and it was suggested that this would tend to discourage the bigger vessels from using the Breakwater Harbour, and force them to the roadstead. On the other hand, it was suggested by the Chairman and other officials of the Harbour Board that it was by no means certain that it would tend to force ships into the roadstead, and that the new scale was designed to make a more equitable charge on ships in accordance with the services rendered by the Harbour Board. Typical instances were: S.s. "Kamo," 725 tons—on berthage rates prior to 1st July, 1927, staying two days and discharging 725 tons of cargo, total berthage paid £16 12s. 3d., equivalent to 6·8d. per ton; under new rates, on the same basis, total berthage paid £12 1s. 8d., equivalent to 5d. per ton. S.s. "Kaiwarra," 1,847 tons—on berthage rates prior to 1st July, 1927, staying five days, discharging 1,847 tons, total berthage paid £17 6s. 4d., equivalent to 2½d. per ton; under new rates, on the same basis, total berthage paid £53 17s. 6d., equal to 7·8d. per ton. A lighter loading 60 tons per trip—Berthage at 3d. per ton equals 15s. per trip, or 1·8d. per ton.

We are not prepared to express an opinion as to how this new charge will operate, but we see no evidence that the alteration in the scale is anything but a legitimate exercise of the Harbour Board's right to cast its scale of charges on what, in the exercise of the discretion and knowledge of members of the Board, seems to be an equitable and proper basis. It may be that experience will show that the higher charges will discourage the bigger vessels from berthing at the wharves, and that will quickly reflect itself in reduced revenue for the Harbour Board. We have no doubt that, if this happens, the Harbour Board will be quick to recognize and remedy the position.

A considerable amount of evidence was also tendered in relation to the amount of the charges for labour, and the incidence of those charges; but, in our opinion the evidence tendered by the Harbour Board justified the nature and incidence of those charges according to present conditions.

No other evidence touching on the subject-matter of the question now before us was tendered to us. Our answer is, therefore, that according to the evidence tendered to us the various harbour dues and charges enumerated in the question are at the present time, and according to the existing law, imposed in an equitable manner as between the different interests enumerated in the question.

PART 19.—THE RECLAMATION PROBLEM.

Our order of reference, paragraph 1 (f), requires us to inquire and report upon: "Whether the reclamation of the areas described in the First and Second Schedules to the Napier Harbour Empowering and Loan Bill, 1926, or any other areas within or adjacent to the Harbour of Napier and the lands vested in the Napier Harbour Board should be authorized; and, if so, to what extent, and by what arrangement can any such reclamation be most economically and satisfactorily accomplished?"

The areas described in the said First and Second Schedules are the Awatoto Block, 28-acre Block, North and South Ponds, and part of West Quay Reclamation Block. (See Plan A, Commission's Exhibit No. 3.)

We are of opinion that the authority sought in the said Bill should be withheld, on the ground that the policy underlying it is related to and dictated by the Board's Inner Harbour policy, which we have reported against in the foregoing portion of our report.

We are of opinion that all the said areas should be reclaimed, but that the whole problem of reclamation should now be reconsidered, and that in deciding which areas should be reclaimed first, and what methods should be adopted, a comprehensive view should be taken covering all areas, all methods, and the interests of all public bodies affected by the problem.

We set out our views on these matters in the following pages, and we set out our recommendation at the end of this part.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF AREAS.

The Legislature has vested in the Napier Harbour Board certain landed endowments in the form of areas of land contiguous to Napier. In general, these might be described as low-lying tidal areas capable of being converted into arable and habitable areas by reclamation. Some of these areas have been reclaimed; a notable instance is the portion of the Borough of Napier known as Napier South, the whole of which has been reclaimed and is now a very closely settled residential area. On Plan A, Commission's Exhibit No. 3, we show the principal areas that are now awaiting reclamation, and on the map we have coloured them so that they may be so distinguished and referred to. Firstly, there are two small areas coloured brown and marked respectively "North Pond" and "South Pond,"

the respective areas being 38 acres and 22 acres, or 60 acres in all. To the south of this is a small block, coloured red, and it is known as the 28-acre Block, and is so marked on the Map A. There is another much larger block, known as the Richmond Block, containing 722 acres; it appears coloured green on Map A. Next we call attention to the Awatoto Block, which contains 590 acres, and appears coloured yellow. Also there is the McDonald Block, containing 700 acres, coloured puce on Map A. Finally, there is a parcel of land known as the West Quay Reclamation Block. Its locality is shown on Map A, where it appears close to the South Pond, lying to the south-west of that area; it is covered in black stippling, and there is printed on this parcel of land, "About 73 acres of land being reclaimed." We shall refer to this hereinafter as the "West Quay reclamation."

METHODS OF RECLAMATION.

We have in the terms of the question submitted to us to consider by what arrangement any such reclamation could be most economically and satisfactorily accomplished. This may be the most convenient place to point out that the engineers and other experts who gave evidence before us on this problem described three different methods of reclamation that could possibly be adopted to make these lands habitable. The first was described by the witnesses as the "siltation method," and this is a term which we shall adopt herein for the purpose of description of the method. It consists in directing the natural processes by which the whole delta, of which these low-lying reclaimed areas are a part, has been formed. The process is to lead the waters of the silt-laden rivers over the land into prepared siltation basins. Napier South was reclaimed in this way. We shall not further refer to this method, because all the witnesses were agreed that this method would be slow, uncertain, costly, and altogether too risky under existing conditions. For instance, Mr. O. N. Campbell, Chief Drainage Engineer, in a report to the Hon. the Minister of Lands on this subject in 1925, speaking of the siltation method, says, "It would be practically impossible to elevate this land by this method above, say, the 22 ft. contour. Lands below this contour could, no doubt, be elevated to this level by the method, but the process would be slow and the cost much higher than is popularly imagined, and, moreover, the risk of damage to already settled lands would be too great."

A second method is to reclaim by suction dredging. Where this method is used there must be installed a dredging plant capable of dredging by suction the sand and silt deposits in the rivers and in the areas adjoining those which it is sought to reclaim, and depositing on the area which is being reclaimed, raising the level of this area to the required height. Mr. Campbell, in the report already referred to, describes this as an ideal method for the areas under review, stating that the sand and silt deposits would be excellent material for economical removal by this method. This method also has the collateral advantage in that it can be economically put into operation as an adjunct to some other scheme—*e.g.*, dredging a harbour, or cleaning out a silted up river-bed, or widening or straightening a river.

The third method described to us is known as the dewatering method. This is described most fully and is advocated in Messrs. Hay and Rochfort's report to the Harbour Board (Exhibit 44). The method can be most conveniently described by directing attention to the Awatoto Block, which appears coloured yellow on Map A. It may be stated that the average level of this block is low-lying. The first step towards reclaiming it by the dewatering method is to erect a retaining-wall or levee around it of sufficient height and strength to keep out flood-water from the contiguous rivers and areas. A draining-basin is then excavated at the lowest point, which in this case would be near the site of the High School, which will be seen marked at the northern end of the Awatoto Block on Map A. At the site of this drainage-excavation a pump-station is erected with an automatically-controlled, electrically-operated pump. This pumps the water over the levee, in this case into the sea and drains are cut through the block leading all surface water to the draining-point. This method is quicker than either of the other two, and is the cheapest; it has the disadvantage that the inhabitants of the area are living on a low level surrounded by an embankment, and are liable to dangers of seepage, burst banks, and failure of the pumping plant.

We desire here to point out that the areas we have been describing are not wholly lagoon-beds or swamps, but are areas which stand at the present time at various stages of natural reclamation. The North Pond and South Pond are tidal lagoons, and require an average of about 8 ft. of filling to raise them to the level of the surrounding areas. The 28-acre Block is almost completely reclaimed. The suction dredging-method has been employed here, and not a great deal of work is required to complete the reclamation of this area and get it ready for subdivision and roading. The McDonald, the Richmond, and the greater part of the Awatoto Block presented during the time that we were at Napier a rather swampy and waterlogged appearance, but we were assured and believe that in the summer-time these blocks are mostly quite dry, and large areas of them are leased for grazing and agricultural purposes. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that parts of the Richmond Block and practically the whole of the McDonald Block are what are known as salt areas, and they cannot be considered as completely reclaimed until the salt is washed out of the land, and this is likely to be a lengthy and somewhat costly process.

This completes a somewhat rapid survey of the material which forms the subject-matter of our present inquiry.

CONFLICTING INTERESTS.

We now desire to call attention to the fact that there are at least four different points of view from which the reclamation problem at Napier may be studied, and each of these was put to us in the course of the inquiry. Two of these points of view are peculiar to the Harbour Board, whilst one of them may be described as the point of view of the Napier Borough Council, and one as the point of view of

the Hawke's Bay Rivers Board. As these represent conflicting interests and ideals, it can be readily understood that they tend to complicate the reclamation problem; whilst, as if there were not sufficient complications in the matter, it was made perfectly clear to us that the feelings and interests raised by the Harbour Board dispute lay athwart the whole question.

One point of view which we have ascribed to the Harbour Board relates only to those areas which are close to the proposed Inner Harbour basin—namely, the North and South Ponds and the West Quay reclamation block. The fate of these blocks has been bound up with that of the Inner Harbour scheme; for the adoption of that scheme meant as a natural corollary that these areas could be most advantageously and economically reclaimed by using the spoil from the Inner Harbour basin; and, further, when they were reclaimed they would have a special value by being adjacent to the Inner Harbour wharves. With these considerations governing the matter the position has arisen that although the Harbour Board agrees that these areas are crying out for reclamation, and that more land is sadly needed to supply the needs of a growing population in Napier, nothing has been done for many years. The presence of these areas near the proposed inner basin and their high potential value when reclaimed have been used as arguments in favour of the Inner Harbour scheme. It is not surprising to find, therefore, that the Harbour Board as at present constituted, with a majority in favour of Inner Harbour construction, has placed the reclamation of these three areas in the very forefront of its programme, and hence we find the power to reclaim them included in the 1926 Bill. It may also be described as good tactics to be able to say to Napier, as the Harbour Board has said, in effect, "You need land, do you? Very well; support our Inner Harbour policy and you will immediately and cheaply obtain the benefit of the reclamation of the North and South Ponds, which can be used for residential purposes."

There is a second point of view, which on some of the evidence tendered to us we may well ascribe to the Harbour Board. It is that it has valuable endowments in these sites capable of being made into habitable lands, and it looks to the income from these, first to assist in the financing of the harbour, and ultimately to provide what has been promised to the district—namely, a free harbour. This policy carried out in accordance with ordinary commercial instincts would require that the Harbour Board should be careful not to glut the market, and it should therefore keep behind rather than in advance of the requirements of Napier, and so keep up the high price of land, and consequently the high rents obtained for small building allotments. The result of this policy, whether it has been consciously pursued or more or less passively taken advantage of, is shown in evidence tendered to us, which proved that Napier is the most densely populated borough or town in the Dominion. Mr. O. N. Campbell's report to the Minister of Lands dated 1925, which we have already called attention to, shows the population statistics relating to the fourteen largest towns and boroughs in New Zealand, and disclosed that Napier, with 977 persons per 100 acres, was from point of density second only to Auckland, the figures being—Auckland, 1,003; Napier, 977; the next highest being Christchurch, 763. Later figures along the same lines were put before us at the hearing by Mr. J. A. Oldham, president of the Real Estate Institute of Napier, and his figures show that Napier now enjoys the unenviable reputation of being the most densely populated town; its relation to Auckland in this respect being disclosed in the respective figures 1,100 and 1,055 persons per 100 acres. In concluding his evidence on this point Mr. Oldham said: "The area made available for residential purposes by reclamation during the last twenty-five years is 213 acres adjoining the borough and 3 acres at the port, or an average of $8\frac{3}{4}$ acres per annum. Since 1912 only 10 acres have been provided by the Harbour Board for residential purposes, or an average of less than $\frac{3}{4}$ acre per annum." The evidence submitted to us on this point by a number of witnesses confirmed what we could see whenever we walked through the residential parts of Napier—namely, that the average allotment is less than $\frac{1}{2}$ acre; and, furthermore, we learned that the ground-rent paid for a section of 18 to 20 perches at the most recent auctioning of residential blocks by the Harbour Board is about £6 or £7 per annum. These prices are paid for sections without borough facilities, left in a comparatively rough state, just as they were on the completion of the filling operations. We visited one such site, the history of which had been related to us. A small house was being built on this allotment by the lessee who had taken over from the successful bidder at the Harbour Board's auction sale and had paid £100 premium for the privilege. These facts show the extreme land-hunger that exists in Napier. We consider that the evidence given by several witnesses to the effect that Napier had been starved for land, and had been deprived of population which was driven to Hastings and other surrounding towns, amply proved their assertions, whilst Mr. J. A. Oldham's statement that the Harbour Board had put only 10 acres of residential land on the market in fifteen years was uncontradicted.

EFFECT ON HOUSING CONDITIONS.

The effect of this on housing conditions in the poorer parts of Napier is shocking. Mr. G. F. Clapcott, the Borough Engineer, in his evidence (see page 491) gives some striking figures. He takes, for instance, an area facing Hardinge Road, in the strip between the North Pond and the sea (see Map A, Commission's Exhibit No. 3). Dealing with forty-four houses, he submits the following: Average frontage of section, 33·35 ft.; average size of section, 2,864 square feet, or 10·5 perches (Napier Boroughs limit is now 5,445 square feet, or 20·4 perches). The average size of these residential allotments is therefore $\frac{1}{16}$ acre. On this area stand forty-four houses, containing 197 rooms in all. A census of these houses revealed 191 occupants—approximately one occupant per room.

Mr. Clapcott referred to two other areas in the same locality presenting the same features. In one of them the figures relate to an aggregate frontage of 21 chains, and the average size of the allotments was $\frac{1}{21}$ acre, and the average number of occupants in the residences erected thereon was 3·47 persons.

In relation to Emerson Street, in the same locality, Mr. Clapcott deposed : “ Without going into particulars, this is a very closely populated area, as a large majority of shopkeepers live on the premises or otherwise let the upper portion of the building as flats. Owing to the land in this area being valued at from £100 to £200 per foot, the greater part of the sections are occupied with the business portion of the building, leaving the residential portion with little or no yard-space, and being two-storied structures with the usual outlook of a lean-to roof.”

We express ourselves as being deeply shocked by this state of things, and when considered in conjunction with Mr. Oldham’s evidence to the effect that in the last fifteen years only 10 acres of residential land has been reclaimed and put on the market, it constitutes a grave indictment of the Harbour Board’s inactivity in the matter of reclamation. Figures showing the high rentals which the Harbour Board is receiving for small residential and business blocks in this locality were put before us for the purpose of sustaining the high potential values of the unreclaimed portions. With all the strength of purpose and vigor of utterance of which we are capable, we urge that the reckoning is not complete until the effect of these awful housing conditions on the physical, mental, and moral equipment of the people is taken into account. We trust that Your Excellency’s Advisers will take adequate steps to see that this evil is remedied as far as possible and that its recurrence is made impossible.

NAPIER’S REQUIREMENTS.

We come now to a point of view which we have ascribed to the Borough Council. We have partly anticipated it by our comments in the immediately preceding paragraph. The Napier Borough requires land for its natural expansion ; evidence placed before us shows that the requirements in this direction might be placed at about 130 building sections per annum. The city is entirely surrounded by the Harbour Board’s endowments, and is in this matter at the mercy of the Harbour Board, which has in the last fifteen years supplied on an average of six sections per annum. The result of this is that the Napier Borough Council is continually being applied to by residents for permission to subdivide the already small allotments into which the town is divided, so that further dwellings may be erected. Mr. William George Martin, a member of the Napier Borough Council, was deputed by that body to give evidence on this matter. He produced a copy of a plan showing the proposed subdivision of a parcel of land containing 29·23 perches. The proposal was to subdivide it into four allotments, and on each erect a residence with out-buildings. This application, we were informed, was refused by the Borough Council ; but the mere fact that it was made shows the scarcity of available building-land from which Napier is suffering. The interests of the Borough of Napier will obviously be best served by a policy which will remove this scarcity and which will place land on the market at a price that will enable a citizen of moderate means to secure a building allotment and build a home. Land-hunger is inevitably associated with high rents.

The Napier Borough Council is interested in an aspect other than the rate at which the Board’s endowments are to be put on the market, and that is the situation of any blocks made available, in relation to the existing lay-out of the borough. There have been conferences between the borough and Harbour Board, which unfortunately have led to no satisfactory result so far, and the borough puts forward the claim that the shape to be assumed by the town, the layout of drainage and transport facilities, and convenience of general access are all matters of the most vital importance to the borough. To bring the precise point of view forward in the form of a concrete example it may be pointed out that the area which the Harbour Board proposes to reclaim first of the total area comprised in the McDonald, Richmond, and Awatoto Blocks is a small portion of 35 acres near the High School, at the apex of the triangle which the Awatoto Block represents. This area lies just beyond the site of the High School—that is, farther away from the town than the High School. The borough representatives point out that this is a longitudinal extension of the residential portion of the town, and that this complicates the problems of access, transport, and drainage. They therefore suggest that the portion of the Richmond Block contiguous to Napier South should first be reclaimed, thus giving a compactness to the city that would not be present if the Harbour Board’s proposal is carried out. It was not made clear to us why the Board preferred to offer first the 35-acre patch on the Awatoto Block, except that, as it had decided to go on with the dewatering scheme, this was the easiest block to dewater, and the one that could most quickly be made ready by that method of reclamation. There may be some reason in that, although, in our opinion, it is quite outweighed if the matter is to be looked at from the point of the greatest good to the greatest number of people, on the considerations put forward by the Borough Council. Furthermore, it does seem to us that the attitude of the Harbour Board is quite unreasonable. Our view of the matter is that with these endowments in its hands the Harbour Board is a trustee for the district, and should view the potentialities of these sites as a trust to be administered, as far as it is reasonably consistent with the Board’s financial requirements, to secure the highest possible benefit to the borough on which it so largely depends. In his report to the Minister of Lands in 1925, Mr. O. N. Campbell, dealing with this matter, said : “ The responsibility for the provision of land rests with the Harbour Board, who absolutely control the situation, and if these lands should succeed in realizing only the bare cost of reclamation, the Board should proceed with the work as a public duty.” With that proposition we are in full accord.

The question has, however, been put to the borough representatives, and it was actually put to them at the inquiry before us, in the following form : “ What right has the Borough Council to dictate to the Harbour Board how it shall use its endowments ? ” The spirit behind this question seems to us to throw some light on the position that has arisen, and the inability of the parties concerned to come to any amicable arrangement.

THE HAWKE'S BAY RIVERS BOARD.

Fourthly, there is the point of view of the Rivers Board. This body is constituted under the Rivers Board Act of 1908, and exercises powers given to it by the Hawke's Bay Rivers Act of 1919. There is an area of 73,740 acres within the jurisdiction of this Board, and part of the Borough of Napier is comprised in that area. The Rivers Board's main function is to formulate and carry into effect schemes for flood-prevention throughout the district, and it has power to borrow and power to levy rates. This Board has, as part of its general scheme, the diversion of the waters or part of the overflow waters of the Tutaekuri, so as to carry them into the open sea south of Napier. Under section 17 of its Empowering Act it may, in case its river-works safeguard the property or works of the Napier Harbour Board, require that Board to contribute to the cost of those works. The Tutaekuri River is the chief menace to the Awatoto and Richmond Blocks, and it is against its possible encroachments that the levees referred to are to be erected. When the matter is under consideration, or when any scheme is designed to remove the menace of the Tutaekuri, it might be expected that the Harbour Board and the Rivers Board would have no difficulty in acting in co-operation. This, however, has not proved to be the case. The position is complicated further by the fact that the constituents of the Rivers Board, spread over a comparatively large district, are, except for those in and about Napier, not particularly interested in any scheme relating to the Tutaekuri, but may be, for instance, more interested in the vagaries of the Tukituki or Ngaruroro Rivers. The trouble is, therefore, that the Rivers Board finds itself unable to raise any loan, for the interest of its constituents is sectional, and there is no general unifying interest that will obtain a sufficient authority to raise a loan for carrying out a work that in the nature of things will be local in its benefits. A fairly well defined scheme for the diversion of the Tutaekuri from the point of Meanee eastwards to the sea has been formulated, and it is estimated that it will cost £90,000, but the Chairman of the Board stated that they are not able to get the ratepayers to sanction the loan. The Rivers Board criticizes adversely the Harbour Board's suggestion that it should build levees along the banks of the Tutaekuri north of the spot at which the Rivers Board proposes eventually to divert the river. The Chairman of the Rivers Board put the matter before us thus: "The Harbour Board is prepared to spend £24,000 on levees around the blocks which they propose to dewater. They say they must do that to provide against the menace of the Tutaekuri; but if they would fall into line with us and assist financially we can divert the Tutaekuri and those levees will not be necessary. Furthermore, we say that then the menace will be removed permanently and effectively, whereas the need of the levees is admittedly temporary, and their efficiency is doubtful." To this the Harbour Board replies that it has little or no faith in the Rivers Board. And so again a position of stalemate is reached between two public bodies.

We have so far sketched the main factors that have to be considered in approaching an answer to the questions which Your Excellency has submitted to us concerning reclamation.

RECLAMATION AS PROPAGANDA.

It will be noted that in this our report we are treating harbour construction and reclamation as entirely separate problems, although in each division of our report there appear certain references to the bearing of the other subject-matter at points where the schemes are related. We propose now to present briefly our views of the precise relation of the two subjects; but before doing so we propose to deal with the method of presenting these related problems which appears to have been adopted by the Harbour Board in the past, and which was certainly put before us at the hearing. That method consisted in looking upon the Harbour Board's endowments which were capable of being reclaimed as a kind of lucky-bag into which the Board could dip for large sums to recoup them the expense of harbour-construction. This aspect is apparent in the electioneering pamphlet (Exhibit 51) issued in 1920 which we have already referred to, when the ratepayers' sanction to the Inner Harbour loan was sought. Under the heading of "Advantages of the Inner Harbour" we read, "It will NOT cost the ratepayers A SHILLING. The land reclaimed alongside the shipping will MORE THAN PAY THE TOTAL COST." (The capitals in these sentences are as they appeared in the pamphlet.)

This same method was adopted even by the Board's consulting engineers when they were engaged in the otherwise prosaic task of submitting engineers' estimates of cost. Thus Holmes and Son's estimates, presented to us at the hearing, gave details of Inner Harbour construction, set out detailed costs of the harbour, then subtracted the sum of £290,000 as value of land reclaimed and called the result the *net cost* of construction of the harbour! When it is considered that expenditure on the harbour-construction would mostly take the form of payment in cash for materials and labour, and that this cash could be provided only by borrowing at current rates of interest, whilst, on the other hand, the endowments consisted largely of semi-swamp lands which have still to be reclaimed, and which the Board does not (as a general policy) propose to sell, it will be seen how specious is this method of presenting the case. Interest on the loan-moneys required to construct the harbour begins to run immediately the money is raised, and no assistance can be given by the endowment until the land is reclaimed, subdivided, roaded, and let, and then the full extent of the relief it can give to the harbour will be afforded by the rents it will produce, which may be applied to assist in payment of the interest on the loans.

The specious presentation we have referred to would deceive no one who took the trouble to think about the matter, but there is no doubt that it is an *ad captandem* form of argument that might be expected to appeal to a public of sporting instincts, and it certainly savours more of the methods of the art-union promoter than those of the business man. The limit to which this misleading form of presentation might be carried is perhaps illustrated by a statement which during our sittings at Napier appeared in the daily press in a large two-column precis of some of the evidence of Mr. R. W.

Holmes, the senior partner in the firm of Holmes and Son, Consulting Engineers to the Board. Mr. Holmes had revised and reduced some of the costs of construction put forward by his son at an earlier stage, and he further stated that, after hearing evidence concerning the reclamations, he desired also to increase the value of land which his firm used as a deduction from the gross cost of construction of the harbour in order to arrive at what they called the net cost, and the result of the figures he then used was to reduce the so-called net cost to £170,000, and he stated the Board now had £124,000 in hand, so that it would only be necessary to raise £46,000 plus value of reclaimed land, which would be an extremely valuable asset. This is the statement which was presented in a two-column precis of Mr. Holmes's evidence in the following words: "From what was stated by Mr. Latham on Wednesday concerning reclamation, Mr. Holmes revised his estimates of the cost of constructing a two-berth Inner Harbour, bringing it down to £170,000—only £46,000 more than the loan-money now in hand for the purpose."

The real truth is (and we have searched in vain through all the utterances of the Harbour Board for any presentation at any time of this aspect of the matter) that in the ordinary way the Harbour Board must raise by way of loan the full gross amount required for harbour-construction, and must pay interest and sinking fund amounting to at least 6 per cent. on that. The assistance to be sought for from the reclaimed lands is the ability of those lands to produce, by way of rents, an annual sum in excess of interest on the cost of reclamation.

We have prepared, and propose to present under this present part of our report, detailed figures showing, on the evidence of witnesses put forward by the Board, the expected cost of reclamation and the expected returns from these reclaimed areas; and we find that for the next decade very little assistance could be given to harbour finance by the returns from reclaimed land.

The productivity in the way of rent of the different blocks varies considerably, and one of the large blocks must for nearly twenty years after its reclamation is commenced be considered as a liability rather than an asset. We refer to the McDonald Block, of 700 acres, which comprises only what have been described as salt lands, and which must be put through a tedious and comparatively expensive process of sweetening before it will have any letting-value.

COSTS OF RECLAMATION.

There is one further aspect of this matter to which we desire to refer. We submit that in principle it is correct that when a public body such as a Harbour Board is carrying out two revenue-producing public works—viz., the construction of a harbour and reclamation of land—it should in its accounts keep correct records of the cost of each of these works. This involves the principle that when any process such as excavation, which provides rock for harbour-construction and spoil for filling in reclamation areas, is undertaken, the best possible basis for apportionment of that cost between the two schemes should be adopted. This is especially important where loans are raised under statutory authority to proceed with reclamation work as distinct from harbour-construction, and *vice versa*. But, apart from this aspect, we believe that the soundness of the principles we submit must be apparent. One argument in favour of it is that it is impossible now to ascertain from the Harbour Board's past records the exact cost of building the breakwater to date, and the exact cost of reclamation to date, because these have been mixed in the accounts of the past, and the items cannot now be dissected accurately. The Board has therefore lost, for comparative purposes, when undertaking new work, part of the value of its existing records.

The method adopted by the Board's consulting engineers is described, and its attempted justification put forward, in the following formula: "When we are quarrying spoil for stone for a breakwater, or dredging harbour basin to get the required depth, we would have to dispose of the spoil if we had no use for it, and in doing so would charge the whole cost of disposition of the spoil to the harbour-works. When, therefore, as in the present case, we can at no additional expense use the spoil for the purposes of reclamation, we still charge the whole cost of excavating or dredging, as the case may be, and disposal of the soil, against harbour-works, and view the reclaimed land *as a gift*, to be brought into account *at its selling-value*, as a deduction to arrive at the net cost of construction of the harbour."

Our submission is that this method is one of those things which needs only to be stated to carry its refutation on its face. The Harbour Board is the custodian of public funds, and should keep the best records possible of the directions in which it has expended those funds. It is also a semi-trading concern, collecting revenue from two forms of public service, in the acquisition of which it has sunk public moneys; and our submission is that it should keep the best records possible of the cost of acquisition of the equipment and assets which makes these services possible. We submit that if, for instance, a land-drainage authority had to clear and improve a large swamp area that was covered in parts with flax, and was required to do this by making the best possible disposal of this flax as a waste and useless product, the total cost, including the cost of disposal of the flax, would be charged up as cost of the drainage project. If, however, the body was entrusted with the power at the same time of running a flax-mill to utilize the flax, we contend that it should apportion its costs, and keep accounts of the flax-mill approximating as nearly as possible to those kept by flax-mills run by private enterprise. This would involve apportioning the cost of getting the flax as nearly as possible at the point of actual cutting of the flax.

METHODS OF RECLAMATION DISCUSSED.

We propose now to deal with the relative desirability of the different methods of reclamation put before us. We have already stated that the siltation method is rejected by all the witnesses and expert advice put before us, and we have no more to say under that heading.

Dewatering Method.—This method is recommended by Messrs. Hay and Rochfort, who, in May, 1926, reported to the Harbour Board on the subject of reclamation. Their recommendation has been adopted, and this method was put forward by the Harbour Board as its scheme for dealing with the Awatoto, Richmond, and eventually with the McDonald Block. It proposes to start with the Awatoto Block and, utilizing embankments that at the present time exist around a large proportion of the boundary of this block, to construct levees to a height of about 2 ft. above expected flood levels, and then to establish a pumping-station at the lowest point somewhere near the High School, and drain the block to that point, pumping the water over the eastern levee into the sea. The Board would next take the Richmond Block, complete the levees and erect the pumping-station, and then, as land is required, subdivide and road it to borough requirements. In the meantime, and to the extent to which these blocks are not subdivided, it is proposed to let them for grazing, agricultural, and small-farm purposes. The arguments in favour of this method are that, firstly, it is quicker, and secondly, that it is much cheaper, than the method of filling by suction dredging, and both of these advantages may be considered as having been proved to exist. It is, however, only fair to Messrs. Hay and Rochfort to point out that they qualify their recommendation of the dewatering method in the following words: "It is obvious that the most businesslike way to remove the flood risk from the Harbour Board endowments and the whole of the district is to carry out the comprehensive scheme of river-control for the Tutaekuri first mentioned; but if there is no hope of getting relief from the operations of the River Board, the third [*i.e.*, dewatering] method would be justifiable."

The views of the Borough Council on this aspect of the matter were put forward by its Engineer, Mr. G. F. Clapcott, who in relation to the reclamation of areas for residential purposes favours the method of raising the level of the ground by suction dredging, discharging the dredged material through pipes on to the land, and thus building it up. Furthermore, the Borough Council is strongly convinced that the portions of the Richmond Block contiguous to Napier South should be made available for residential purposes before any portion of the Awatoto Block is so treated. Mr. Clapcott prepared a plan of a proposed subdivisional scheme relating to a block that would be approached by a bridge across the Tutaekuri at the point where Kennedy Road in Napier South runs into St. George's Drive, and entering on the Richmond Block at the point marked "Thornton's Boat-shed." The arguments adduced by Mr. Clapcott and other opponents of the dewatering scheme may be summarized as follows: (1) Under the dewatering scheme the land is left at so low a level that subsoil-water will be continually present at about 1 ft. below the surface, and that it will be impossible satisfactorily to drain residential areas under these conditions. (2) The area will be dependent for all time for the efficiency of its surface-draining on the pumping-plant, and that it is just when a combination of abnormal circumstances, such as flood, storms, and high seas, make the maintenance of this pumping most essential that it is likely to be put out of action by those very same natural forces. This aspect of the matter was referred to by Mr. C. D. Kennedy, a qualified engineer with a great deal of experience of this problem in the Napier district. He is an advocate of the dewatering system. He says (see page 342, Notes of Evidence), "With regard to the dewatering scheme I agree that it is the best practicable scheme, but there is one possible drawback which must not be overlooked that would arise in heavy spring tides in easterly weather with seas piling up on the beach. There would in such circumstances be a considerable amount of seepage, and this would have to be coped with. It would mean a little extra pumping-power. The drain suggested would probably catch it and hold it, but the extra pumping-power would be necessary. It would be wise to consider that such a storm and heavy rain coming at once, there would be a combination of adverse conditions." (3) There is always the danger of the levees breaking and swamping the lands on which people have been enticed to erect their homes. (4) The levees erected to keep out flood-waters must be continually raised, as the river tends to raise its own bed by the deposit of silt (see pages 9, 19 of this report, under heading "Physical Features of District and Natural Forces arising therefrom.") There are now places in the district where this process has gone on until the bed of the river is actually some feet higher than the surrounding ground. (5) From a consideration of the foregoing reasons, and also from sentimental reasons, there will always be a prejudice by residents of the district against erecting their residences on a dewatered area. (6) In view of the existence and powers of the Hawke's Bay River Board, it is probable that in the not-distant future the waters of the Tutaekuri will be wholly diverted to the sea at a point south of the Awatoto and Richmond Blocks, and that when this is done the erection of the levees will represent a useless expenditure, and that therefore it would be better to take a more comprehensive view of the whole problem and work with the Rivers Board in procuring an early diversion of the river. Conversely, (7) areas raised by deposition of silt and spoil, being higher, are more easily and effectively drained, and are therefore healthier. (8) Cost of pumping leaves a perennial charge against the land, whereas under the other method—when the original loan is wiped out by sinking fund—the land is free of reclamation charges.

Raising Land by Deposit of Spoil.—This method is preferred by Mr. O. N. Campbell, whose report (Exhibit No. 42) we have already referred to. He says on the first page of that report (dated 1925), "As the total area of Harbour Board endowment lands is only 2,045 acres, the Board need not consider the question of development of these lands for any other than residential purposes. Land for this purpose must obviously be freed from all danger of serious flooding, and it is therefore preferable that it should be elevated to a point above the maximum flood level." Later on he says, "The reclamation should be carried out by suction dredging, for which the area is an ideal one. The sandy silt deposits would be excellent material for economical removal by this method."

Mr. G. F. Clapcott, the Borough Council's Engineer, strongly advocated, in relation to residential areas, the adoption of this method of raising by depositing spoil, and he gave details, which will later appear in our estimates and conclusions, of his methods and estimated cost of reclamation by this method.

As to the 28-acre Block and the North and South Ponds, and the West Quay reclamation, it is agreed that they can most conveniently and economically be reclaimed by building them up with spoil pumped in by adjacent silt-bearing areas.

TREATMENT OF SALT LANDS.

Practically the whole of the McDonald Block and parts of the Richmond Block are permeated with salt deposited by the sea when these areas were daily flooded by the tides, and we have a great deal of evidence about the processes and amount of work required to sweeten this land and make it productive. Mr. J. McDonald, a farmer of many years' experience of a farm adjoining the McDonald Block, was pessimistic about the prospects of ever converting the McDonald Block into farm areas. His evidence in brief is that he has tried every known method without success and without prospect of success being in sight.

Mr. C. D. Kennedy, whom we believe to be as well qualified as any person in the district to speak on the subject, took a more hopeful view. We refer to his evidence on this point on pages 344 and 345 of the Notes of Evidence. He says, "If you carry your drainage to a low-enough point under the dewatering scheme it is possible to bring the land in as farming-land. The drainage is essential." The artesian water-supply which is available here must be used, and the water must be flooded more than once, the object being to wash the salt into the drains and so carry it away. It must be ploughed deeply and well pulverized to allow the rains to permeate it, and that again would tend to carry the salt to the drains. He continues: "I have so treated a small area which at the beginning would grow nothing, and I eventually got a crop of barley from it. I do not represent this is a quick process; it would take years to get the land into a condition to produce a crop. I have had no experience in flooding a large area. . . . With the most energetic measures in ploughing, liming, &c., it would be possible to get this land into cultivation in four or five years. For ordinary commercial purposes it would take nine or ten years. There is not much initial value in the land. I consider that the value, say, at the end of ten years, would be sufficient to give an initial value to the land. If the Board drained and cut up this area it could expect very little, if any, return from it for, say, twenty years. Eventually it would rank with the best land in the district. . . . Hay and Rochfort's estimate of cost of reclaiming McDonald's Block is £28,000. If that is correct, or whatever the correct amount may be, the Board must face the prospect of paying interest on that amount for ten years before it begins to get a return." Mr. G. F. Clapcott also gives evidence of his experience and knowledge of reclamation work on a somewhat similar area at Invercargill. We refer to his evidence on this point contained in a letter addressed to the Chairman of this Commission and appearing as Exhibit No. 131. We think the evidence on this point given by Mr. C. D. Kennedy is reliable, and sets out a reasonable basis on which the Harbour Board may base its expectations in relation to the McDonald Block. We would summarize this into a statement that when the Harbour Board commences the reclamation of this block it must face an initial expenditure of nearly £30,000, and that the amount so expended will carry interest but produce no income for at least ten years. Thereafter for another ten years it is probable that any benefit derivable from the land will have to be allowed to the parties that in the initial ten years have undertaken the work and expense of sweetening the block. If the interest on this money were capitalized during this period of twenty years, the effect would be, approximately, to double the cost. Another way of looking at the problem is that when the McDonald Block is reclaimed the interest on the cost of reclamation at 6 per cent. will wholly absorb the returns from about £36,000 worth of other reclaimed areas. It is clear, then, that, in the words of Mr. A. E. Jull, Chairman of the Harbour Board, when recalled on the last day of our sitting, "The McDonald Block is in the future."

CONCLUSIONS.

We now propose to draw these various considerations to stated conclusions and recommendations, and in doing so we propose to take a comprehensive view of the whole problem. Our recommendation in the matter of harbour policy cuts out from our considerations the dominating influence of Inner Harbour construction as a deciding factor in the question of what areas shall be first reclaimed and what methods shall be adopted to reclaim them. We are viewing the matter of reclamation as a problem being considered by a Harbour Board whose policy for a decade is the restoration to complete efficiency of its existing harbour facilities and the consolidation of its financial position. From this point of view it becomes necessary to consider the activities (actual and potential) of the Hawke's Bay River Board. We are satisfied that a scheme based on the erection of levees as a temporary expedient of dewatering the Awatoto and Richmond Blocks, as a cheaper method, is, in view of the defects of the dewatering system and the prospect of the ultimate diversion of the Tutaekuri, a short-sighted and wasteful method, and we recommend that, along lines which we shall indicate later, the immediate requirements for the expansion of the residential portions of Napier should be supplied by adopting the method of building up the levels by dredged spoil.

ORDER IN WHICH BLOCKS SHOULD BE RECLAIMED.

We are of opinion that the 28-acre Block should first be reclaimed, and we are satisfied that this can be done promptly and at very little expense. Mr. C. D. Kennedy says, at Page 341, "The 28-acre Block wants very little. In my opinion a few weeks' work pumping would complete it—pumping in silt. It could be made ready for occupation in three months from completion—that is, roaded, channels, &c. With drainage, it would take six months. This block could easily be connected with

borough sewerage and drainage system. Assuming proper equipment and a vigorous policy, the 28-acre Block could be got ready in nine months from the start quite easily. The Harbour Board have the equipment in hand to undertake this work with the exception that a new pontoon would be required; the machinery is intact." We accept the evidence of this competent witness without reserve, and base the foregoing recommendation on it. Practically all the witnesses who referred to this point agreed with Mr. Kennedy on it.

With regard to the North and South Ponds, we agree that eventually they must be reclaimed, and that when reclaimed they will afford valuable residential and industrial sites. We do not, however, share the views of Mr. A. E. Jull that they are more desirable as residential sites than the areas near to Napier South—that is, the areas on the other side of Scinde Island. We agree with him that if in the existing state of land-hunger they were reclaimed they would be rapidly taken up, but that would be not so much an indication of their real value as building-sites as a further demonstration, if it were needed, of the deplorable state of things which has led residents to seek to subdivide small sections into four building allotments. In fact, we expect that some of the dominant party's enthusiasm for the North and South Ponds as residential areas will vanish if our recommendations as to a harbour-construction policy are adopted.

Next after the recommendation of the 28-acre Block, we are strongly of opinion that the utmost consideration should be shown to the representations of the Napier Borough Council. A glance at Map A (Commission's Exhibit No. 3), noting the general shape of the present residential part of Napier comprising Scinde Island and Napier South, will convince any reasonable person that extension of the borough over on to the Richmond Block should precede its extension by the subdivision of the northern point of the Awatoto Block. An advantage of the method of reclaiming the level is that portions of a block such as the Richmond Block can be dealt with in areas large enough to allow for the adoption of town-planning ideals, and yet small enough to avoid large amounts of expenditure in advance of the possibilities of the land being taken up. We think the suggestion that areas of about 50 acres at a time should be put in hand by this method is a good one. As for the reclamation of the West Quay Block, it can hardly be suggested that this is a residential area. Its reclamation is closely related to the construction works going on and anticipated at the West Quay of the Inner Harbour, and we think that the requirements and methods in this direction may be left to the Harbour Board as a part of its policy in relation to the Inner Harbour.

We have more than once in the course of this report, when a certain aspect of the reclamation problem was put before us, expressed the opinion that for a decade at least the reclaimed lands cannot be expected to do much more than pay interest on the cost of reclamation. We have more than once, on the other hand, called attention to the freely expressed belief of the dominant party on the Harbour Board in the potential value of these lands. We agree that there is a potential value, but we submit that the potential value should be studied and assessed on business lines, and that extravagant values and statements should be avoided.

POTENTIAL VALUES OF RECLAIMED LAND.

It cannot be denied that these lands will in the more distant future possess a value in excess of their present-day value, or of their probable value ten years hence, but we think that their future potential value is not nearly as great as some of the representations we heard might lead us to believe. We submit that there are two ways in which these potential values may be realized. One is by the value of land generally so increasing in the borough and its environs that the rents of all residential blocks will be raised at the periodical renewals of the leases and revaluations of the rentals; another way is by the growth of the business and residential area of Napier causing the surrounding areas to be subdivided into residential allotments and thus leading to a larger proportion of the Board's endowments producing suburban rents instead of rural rents. It seems to us that there are limits to the operation of both these tendencies. The present average ground-rent of a 26-perch section is about £7 per annum, and in a typical block of such sections which we inspected the class of dwelling now being erected thereon is worth on an average about £800 (see page 250, Notes of Evidence). We suggest that on that basis the ground-rent and interest on cost of buildings taken together constitute an annual charge upon the householder which is just about as high as it is possible to go without becoming excessive. It is not apparent, therefore, how the Board can expect much increase in these suburban rentals from householders of that class.

It is not easy to see how the Harbour Board can for many years expect much increase in these rents, unless it comes as part of a very general increase in the cost of living, in which case the benefit to the Board will tend to be offset by the increase in its own cost of administration. Secondly, the values of land in the outlying townships, Hastings, Taradale, and Greenmeadows, will always tend to have a steadying effect on land-values in Napier. We have already referred to the evidence of experts in the matter, which convinced us that one of the results of the land-hunger and high rents in Napier had been to cause prospective residents in Napier to settle in Hastings, and to travel backwards and forwards daily to their businesses in Napier. Present-day motor transport tends to annihilate distance and to facilitate the growth of outlying residential areas, and this inevitably governs the rate of advance in the valuations of residential areas nearer the business centres.

Mr. J. H. Oldham gave evidence (see page 596) that sections situated within one and a half to two miles radius from the chief post-office in Hastings could be obtained at from £120 to £150 per quarter-acre section. Taking £135 as the average of those two prices, and calculating 5 per cent. on the capital value (5 per cent. being the basis on which the Napier Harbour Board rentals are fixed), we have an annual value of £6 15s. for a $\frac{1}{4}$ -acre section of natural soil in pleasant surroundings, and

close to Hastings, and reasonably close to Napier. Mr. Oldham also deposed that a similar section within a half-mile radius of the Taradale Post-office would command from £75 to £100 per section. Taking the higher of these two figures, we have an annual value of £5 per annum. We are of opinion that the existence of $\frac{1}{4}$ -acre sections at Hastings and Taradale at annual values of £6 15s. and £5 respectively, considered in relation to £7 for a $\frac{1}{8}$ -acre section of reclaimed land, will have a steadying effect on values at Napier, especially when a reasonable policy of reclamation at a rate sufficient to appease the present land-hunger is in operation.

EXPENSES OF RECLAMATION.

There is no disguising the fact that the reclamation of the Harbour Board's endowments at Napier will be quite an expensive proceeding. The figures which we shall submit show that the primary cost is considerable, and that the Board's endowments in reality consist not of land, but of sites capable of being converted into dry land, as the term is ordinarily understood, at the expenditure of considerable sums of money. Furthermore, when 100 acres of land, for instance, has been reclaimed, 20 per cent. of it becomes non-producing at once by being appropriated to reserves and roads; and the cost of roading has been estimated by Messrs. Hay and Rochfort at £200 per acre over the gross area. Thus, taking the 100-acre block again for illustrative purposes, the cost of survey, subdivision, and roading on that estimate would be £20,000. This cost, plus the cost of reclamation, must be spread over the net area of 80 acres. Again, loan-money to carry out the reclamation work must be raised in advance of the actual work of construction, and interest on these loans during construction and up to the point of time when the land can first be offered to intending residents adds considerably to the cost of the land. Legal costs, printing, advertising, and auctioneers' charges are also appreciable. These factors must be kept carefully in view when studying the figures which we submit later, showing the probable position of the Harbour Board after a decade of a progressive reclamation policy.

RECOMMENDATION.

We now approach the precise question submitted to us by Your Excellency in relation to the reclamation problem. The recitals which introduce our order of reference include a reference to the Napier Harbour Board Empowering and Loan Bill, 1926, and its introduction into Parliament in that year, and recites, "but after consideration thereof was not allowed to proceed, and it is expedient that a Commission should be appointed to inquire into and report as to the necessity or expediency of the proposed legislation." And the subsequent question contained in the order of reference is "Whether the reclamation of the Awatoto Block, the 28-acre Block, North and South Ponds Block, and a part of West Quay reclamation should be authorized, and, if so, to what extent and by what arrangement can such reclamation be most economically and satisfactorily accomplished?"

Briefly stated, we are of opinion that the Bill in question should not be allowed to proceed, for we are convinced of the expediency of repealing the proposed legislation. The evidence satisfies us that the Board's proposals to reclaim immediately the North and South Ponds and part of the West Quay reclamation were part and parcel of the Inner Harbour scheme, and were dictated by a policy of consolidating that scheme and committing the district to it by the prosecution of every work that was either in itself a partial construction of that harbour, or the committal of the district to a policy and to forms of expenditure that bound the district to the Inner Harbour scheme for all time.

As we have reported against the adoption of that Inner Harbour scheme, we are of opinion that these reclamation authorities, in so far as they are incidental to that Inner Harbour scheme, should be reconsidered. We set out the following principles which in our opinion govern the whole matter, and submit that the future policy must be based on the best reconciliation possible between these principles where they appear to conflict.

- (1) The Harbour Board, while it is entrusted with the duties and responsibilities bestowed upon it as a Harbour Board, should have its right to its endowments preserved intact.
- (2) While the primary use of these endowments is to assist the Board in its financial problems, a very strong secondary consideration is that it should use them so as to conserve and further the interests of the Borough of Napier, which is one of the most important constituents of the Harbour Board.
- (3) Any reclamation undertaken should be part of a comprehensive policy which contemplates the ultimate reclamation and protection of the whole of the Board's endowments.
- (4) No authority to reclaim any part of the lands should be bestowed until the relation of the part proposed to be reclaimed to the whole comprehensive policy of reclamation has been made clear.
- (5) No authority to reclaim should be bestowed until it is made clear that the Harbour Board is giving reasonable consideration to the wishes and rights of the Napier Borough Council, the Hawke's Bay Rivers Board, and any other public bodies which may be interested.

It seems to us that before any progress can be made in the matter of reclamation a working scheme governed by and consistent with these principles must be evolved. The question submitted to us in Part 1 (f) of our order of reference—"By what arrangement can such reclamation be most economically and satisfactorily accomplished?" would probably justify an attempt on our part to

outline a definite and detailed scheme of reclamation. We think, however, that, for two reasons, we should not attempt to do so. The first is that the comprehensive scheme that we have recommended for adoption cannot be formulated until it is known precisely what the policy of the Hawke's Bay Rivers Board is in relation to the Tutaekuri River. The second reason is that any scheme we suggest would have to be carried out by the Harbour Board in conjunction with, at least, the Rivers Board and the Napier Borough Council, and it would be as unwise as it would be difficult to attempt to coerce or restrain those self-governing bodies in relation to this work.

If the Harbour Board recognizes the reasonableness and fairness of the principles that we have outlined above, we would like to see it entrusted with the task of endeavouring to put those principles into operation, with the co-operation of the other Boards interested and affected. If the problem is approached with a desire to meet the present needs of the district along the lines suggested by the foregoing principles, such a scheme should be successful. If, on the other hand, the will to carry out such a scheme is not present, any scheme formulated by us at the present juncture for adoption and enforcement in the future would not be likely to succeed, and the position will then be met by Your Excellency's Advisers.

We were informed that the Rivers Board has appealed to the Minister of Public Works for the appointment of an independent engineer to advise it in the adoption of a scheme for the protection of the district from river troubles, and we understand that this appointment has been made. We were informed that the Borough Council and Harbour Board have, prior to our sitting, met in conference to discuss reclamation in relation to Napier's needs. We suggest that these conferences be reopened, and that co-operation with the Rivers Board in the light of their latest expert advice and this report be sought, and that an endeavour be made along these lines to submit to Your Excellency's advisers a comprehensive scheme.

In connection with our inquiry into harbour matters we had to deal with specific projects designed and to some extent carried out in the past, and in the very nature of things our recommendations had to take the form of approval or censure, direction, and restraint. We went to the district as three quite disinterested and, we trust, reasonable men, and we have dealt with the harbour problem in the light of the evidence we heard and according to the best of our ability and knowledge, and with a sincere desire to help the district in its difficulties. We believe that we have under that heading tendered advice which is in the best interests of the district.

In regard to the problem of reclamation, however, we are dealing with a scheme of another nature; it lies in the future, and can now be formulated and dealt with in a comprehensive way without the complications and distractions of the harbour dispute, if our advice on the former matter is followed.

We would therefore prefer to end this portion of our report on a note of appeal. We understand that, in accordance with Your Excellency's usual practice, the matter of this report will be made known to the people of the district affected by it, and we wish, Sir, through you and by this procedure, to make an appeal to the interested parties to unite in an endeavour to deal with this present matter in a comprehensive and reasonable way for the good of the district as a whole. May we close this portion of our report with the hope that the present recommendation, which comes from three wholly disinterested men desirous of serving the province, should be accepted as a basis on which the interested local bodies should work together.

We desire to recommend definitely that the authority to complete the reclamation of the 28-acre Block should be preserved, or granted, as the case may be, and that, if desired, the cost of so doing should be paid out of the unexpended loan-moneys which in Part 14 (a) of our report we suggested should be held in reserve for harbour-works. We are further of opinion that, in accordance with the desire of the Napier Borough Council, the next portion of the Board's endowments to be reclaimed should be that portion of the Richmond Block which lies across the Tutaekuri River from St. George's Road, Napier South. We recommend that a portion of that block, to the extent of, say, 50 acres at least, in accordance with the plans of the borough's Engineer, should be undertaken as soon as possible, and that the balance of the unexpended loan-moneys referred to in Part 14 (a) hereof should be authorized to be spent on this work. Thereafter, our recommendation is that the formulation and approval of a plan of reclamation in accordance with the principles we have enunciated above should be left to the Harbour Board, and to Your Excellency's executive and administrative officers, in accordance with the provisions of the Harbours Act.

We append a statement prepared from figures supplied by Messrs. Hay and Rochfort in Exhibit No. 44, and from the evidence of Mr. G. F. Clapcott, setting out the aggregate cost of reclamation along lines consistent with their respective schemes. This statement contemplates the reclamation of 500 acres of the Richmond Block, and 60 acres of the North and South Ponds, by pumping silt to raise the level of the lands, and the reclamation of the Awatoto Block and the rural portion of the Richmond Block by the dewatering method. These methods, may, of course, require to be modified in accordance with the decision arrived at by the Rivers Board, and if so the effect will be, of course, to tend to modify or vary the statement of cost. The figures representing the aggregate cost of reclamation purport to show the position arrived at at the end of, say, a ten-years programme, when the blocks there set out have been fully reclaimed and occupied. We accompany it by a statement of the expected aggregate rentals from those reclaimed lands at the end of that period.

The progressive system of reclamation and the gradual settlement of the lands will, of course, proceed concurrently. We submit, however, that in carrying out such a scheme there would be no point short of completion at which the position would be better than it is at the point represented by our figures—viz., the point when the blocks are wholly reclaimed and wholly revenue-producing.