

## A.—(A. STUBBS.)

1. That Driver Wellings's complaint that the drain in question was affecting his well has not been substantiated.

2. Doctor Godfrey, of Waipukurau, condemned the well long before the drain was laid—viz., in February, 1894—at the time that a member of Fireman Seymour's family was suffering from typhoid fever, and gave it as his opinion that the well was polluted by drainage from Wellings's fowlhouse and other adjoining offices.

3. That Wellings now admits that it is more likely that the pollution of his well was caused through surface drainage in the immediate locality of the well.

4. That it would be impossible for any leakage from the new drain to find its way to the well, as it would have to filter through a bed of cement shingle a chain wide before reaching the well.

5. That it was unnecessary to have taken up a portion of the drain to determine whether any leakage was affecting the well. It would have been sufficient to have cut a short trench parallel to the drain at the turntable cesspit, the nearest point to the well.

6. That the fact of the inlet-pipe being slightly below the outlet-pipe at the above cesspit is not detrimental to the working of the drain.

7. That the very inferior pipes used in this portion of the drain would account for the slight leakage discovered, and also give the drain a crooked appearance.

8. That Mason Fee was off duty (ill) during the time this portion of the drain was laid, and the work had to be done by Labourer Nelson and Casual-labourer Hone.

9. That owing to the extraordinary amount of work being done on the section at this time, and the fact of my district being much enlarged—viz., by adding on the Manawatu Gorge length and the Foxton branch—it necessitated my being almost constantly away from head-quarters—a fact my diary for 1894 amply proves.

10. That during the time of Mason Fee's illness and my absence from head-quarters a carpenter was left in charge of the work, whose duty it was to put in the concrete-boxings for forming the cesspits and to generally supervise the work.

11. That the fact that this work being at head-quarters would not enable me to give the work extra supervision (but the reverse), owing to the small amount of time at my disposal being taken up with arrears of office-work, giving instructions to workmen, &c.

12. That the charge made against me of gross carelessness in carrying out the work is unjust, and that my application to review the correspondence referring to the complaints has not been acceded to, thereby placing me at a disadvantage in defending my character against the charges brought against me.

## B.—(J. FOWLER.)

1. That I was not under the influence of drink as alleged.

2. That in any event I had no drink during working-hours, as alleged.

3. That the decision of the said officer at Invercargill is unjust and wrong, and against the weight of evidence.

4. That I was not guilty of any misconduct on the date alleged whereby I deserved or merited suspension or reduction in grade.

## C.—(R. P. BRAY.)

1. That extra traffic during the holiday season was on.

2. The grain season was in full swing.

3. I am rated as a clerk and not as Stationmaster.

4. The assumption of the duties of Stationmaster with the carrying out of other ordinary daily duties was as much as ought to have been expected from me.

5. That under the circumstances it must be admitted that a great, and, as it proved, too great, a strain was put upon me by the presence of the auditor when the station was minus the head officer.

6. The long hours I had been on duty immediately preceding the accident.

7. I am twenty-two years of age, and if I had been appointed to the charge of a station it would have been, in the ordinary course of events, a third-class one.

8. Three other parties besides myself are implicated in the trouble.

## D.—(T. TANGNEY.)

1. The decision is due to an inquiry held at Thornbury, Southland; such inquiry was not called to consider whether I was giving satisfaction to the department.

2. The inquiry was called by departmental notice on account of one Williams, then in my gang, complaining that on a particular date I was neglecting duty by being within a hotel during working-hours, and so keeping him twenty-five minutes behind the usual hour of knocking off. (I was instructed to delay the surface-men when necessary to suit casual hands at ballast train).

3. The complaint of Williams was, I maintain, not substantiated by evidence at the inquiry, as I was allowed to be present during the whole of the proceedings.

4. If the department was of opinion that the evidence at the inquiry convicted me, I received no notice on what part, if any, of that evidence I had been found guilty.