

TABLE J.—SHORT SUMMARY OF NAVIGATION EXPERTS' EVIDENCE.

Witness.	Inner Harbour.	Breakwater Harbour.
W. H. Hartman, master s.s. "Tamaroa." Trading to New Zealand for past twenty-seven years. (See Evidence, pages 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117.)	With big vessel would wait for slack water before navigating channel; tug necessary at flood and ebb tides, and possibly at slack water; harbour safe; velocity of current no detriment; when entering subjected to beam sea and wind; if strong wind or heavy sea would wait outside or inside; consider range would not be increased by widening channel between moles; subsequently considered would be increased	No difficulty in navigating; enter head-on in easterly weather; prefer breakwater; 1,300 ft. swinging-basin sufficient; tug required; safe harbour; vessel would not lay so steady; bound to get range, which will be less when harbour completed; owners will not allow him to use present unfinished Breakwater Harbour.
S. A. Chatfield, master s.s. "Kaituma." Trading here a good deal. (Pages 118, 119, and 120.)	No difficulty in bringing the "Kaituma," drawing 17 ft. 6 in., into the present Inner Harbour at high water; velocity of current between moles, 6 to 7 knots	Never had to leave breakwater; have been there several times.
W. Waller, Harbourmaster. New Plymouth. Experience since 1874; a great deal of experience on this coast. (Pages 121, 122, and 123.)	Would wait for slack water before navigating proposed channel; would not work proposed channel at night; proposed Inner Harbour more sheltered than Breakwater Harbour; current at end of moles would tend to deflect vessel's course; beam sea would tend to force vessel on to side of channel	Worked present breakwater for five years; never had to leave owing to bad weather; consider there would be no difficulty in entering harbour when completed.
L. C. H. Worrall, captain; retired from Union Steamship Co. Retired twelve months ago; experience since 1876. (Pages 123, 124, and 125.)	In big seas would not attempt to take large vessel in, even with tug; considers it would not be advisable to work channel at night; a tug would be required in calm weather; the current at end of moles would deflect vessel	Worked breakwater; never had trouble; have been alongside in S.E. seas; never had to go past breakwater; thinks complete harbour would be a success; Breakwater Harbour decidedly safer; no trouble from range.
A. M. Edwin, master, coastal pilot. Been at sea thirty-six years; worked Napier weekly for two years. (Pages 125, 126, and 127.)	Difficult to navigate entrance to Inner Harbour; could only work it at slack water once in twenty-four hours; a tug would be required	Worked breakwater; occasionally broke things up (springs); stayed in all weather; prefers Breakwater; can enter and leave at any state of tide; when swell too big worked under lee of breakwater.
H. Collins, Harbourmaster, Nelson. Twenty years Harbourmaster at Nelson; before that 2nd and 3rd officer Union Steamship Co. (Pages 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, and 133.)	Entrance quite safe with moderate breeze; channel could be worked at night; no tug required; prefers Inner Harbour; 7-knot current dangerous; 2 to 3 knots not dangerous; currents caused by tide-deflector increase risk; always be a certain amount of range	Swinging-basin 1,300 ft. big enough; considers height of breakwater not sufficient.
H. White-Parsons, Harbourmaster, Napier. Harbourmaster at Napier for thirteen years; total of thirty-five years' experience at sea. (Pages 167, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, and 176.)	Would bring vessels in at high and low water slack; doubts if channel could be worked at night; a tug would be required; beam sea and wind; would not take vessel in if there was a range; considerable range in harbour at present	During thirteen years as Harbourmaster have not had an accident; when harbour completed no difficulty in entering during reasonable N.E. weather; only 3 per cent. per year have had to leave owing to bad weather; during strong easterlies easier to enter breakwater; during heaviest seas, range at present from 3 ft. to 3 ft. 6 in., then not safe to berth; if completed, consider it would be satisfactory in every respect; in all but abnormal weather no difficulty in entering. Maximum draught of vessel berthed to date, 26 ft. 3 in.; if harbour completed as proposed, no necessity for vessels to leave breakwater owing to bad weather; by using the breakwater considers saving to vessel, as against working the roadstead, up to 40 per cent.
H. Brown, master of s.s. "Port Melbourne," 12,450 tons. Trading to Napier since 1904. (Pages 206, 207, 208, 209, and 210.)	In ordinary weather no difficulty in working proposed channel; would work in moonlight; would require a tug; prefers the more sheltered aspect	His owners will not allow him to use the present Breakwater Harbour; he would require a tug; Breakwater Harbour more easily affected by bad weather.
T. H. Chudley, marine superintendent, Shaw, Savill, and Albion Co. At sea actually thirty years, ashore thirteen years; holds master's certificate; trading to New Zealand since 1891. (Pages 223, 224, 225, and 226.)	Doubtful; could only be worked at top of high water, and then would require smooth water and no more than moderate breeze; would require two tugs; heavy swell would cause vessel to roll and draw extra 2 ft.; prefer lightering in bay to entering proposed Inner Harbour or completed Breakwater Harbour	Could use breakwater Harbour at any state of the tide; entrance satisfactory considering prevailing winds; swinging-basin 1,300 ft. satisfactory; sees no reason why ocean-going vessels should not use Breakwater Harbour when completed; of the two completed harbours, prefers Breakwater, but would prefer lightering in bay to using either.