

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