

102. And supposing the Minister, or person appointed by him, made a mistake which had the effect of casting a very heavy financial burden upon the people of the city, what would you say to that?—I do not consider that.

103. Do you not think that might be a very serious matter to the people of the city who had to shoulder the burden?—I have not considered that question.

104. A very important one, is it not?—Yes, I should require time to think it over

105. Well, in common fairness, supposing the Minister had the power of deciding a matter and the local authorities differed from the Minister, do you not think that the people of this city should have some right of appeal to an impartial tribunal in order to save the rights of the people themselves?—I think the rights of the people would be rightly conserved by the Minister. I have full confidence in the Government.

106. Then you still think there should be no right of appeal where the local bodies and the Government are at variance on a matter involving an expenditure of £50,000?—I would leave it to the Minister, with the expert knowledge he would have.

107. That is your idea of trusting the people and the people's representatives?—I trust the Minister and the Government. They had to put a priest in a little while ago to fill up a vacancy in a local body

108. Is it because you think that the men would be able to get more concessions from the Government than from the local authorities—candidly?—I do not think it applies to either. We have to deal with our employer in a Court of law. That is where we get a concession.

109. Why should you be so anxious that the Government should have this authority, and not the local authority?—Because the local authority has made such a hash of things so far

110. Leaving out this question of requirements and inconvenience, do you not think the requirements of the traffic and the question of the public convenience are best left to the local body, and if they make a hash of it, so much the worse for the people?—Everybody concerned gets into trouble when they make a hash of things—the employees as well.

111. You say you think the Government should look after the time-tables?—Unquestionably

112. At present the time-tables are subject to the approval of the City Council?—Yes.

113. And you have made representations to the City Council from time to time, and in some cases, at all events, the City Council has afterwards differed from you?—In all cases with regard to the extension of the running-time.

114. And I suppose you think that if the Minister had the matter in his hands he would alter the time-table?—Mr. Holmes certified to the running-time being too fast, and Mr. Richardson, the Manager of the Wellington Tramways, was associated with him in that opinion.

115. Then, as Mr. Holmes is Engineer-in-Chief at present, at all events, may I take it that if the matter was in the hands of the Minister you would get an alteration in the time-table?—In the running-time we may get an extension.

116. Supposing the matter was in the hands of the Minister, and you represented the matter to the Minister, and he disagreed with you, what would you have to say?—The same as when the City Council refused to give us any concession.

117. That is that the Minister would be wrong?—We should consider that we had not got what we wanted, and should have to abide by his decision.

118. We come now to the question of the Appeal Board: Do you consider that every worker should have the right of appeal from a dismissal or from a withheld promotion?—Yes.

119. Every employee?—Yes.

120. Whether in the public service or private employment?—Yes.

121. Then, according to your view, section 6 in this Bill, giving you the right of appeal, is but the thin end of the wedge to giving every worker in private employment the same right eventually?—We are distinct from other workers.

122. In your opinion the same right should be extended to every worker whether in public or private employment?—I think they should have the right of appeal to an independent authority or party

123. Do you not think that would rather revolutionize matters as between employers and employees?—I have not considered it in the wider sense. I have not given it much consideration, but I would favour it.

124. Can you not see that the result of that might force upon the employer a man in whom he had no confidence?—I do not think so.

125. Supposing there is to be an Appeal Board, would you be satisfied with the Arbitration Court as that Appeal Board?—No.

126. Are the members of that not independent?—Yes.

127. Then why not be satisfied with them?—Because I should like to have a say in picking the representatives of the men, and I have not had it in regard to the workers' representative in the Arbitration Court.

128. Would you like to have a say in the picking of the men to represent the person discharged, and may I put it that you would like to have a say in telling that representative whom you would like as Chairman of the Appeal Board?—Yes.

129. So that you would not leave it to the independent judgment of the representatives of the men and the company, but you would impress upon your representative the name of the person whom you would like to have, and whom you would like him to ask for as Chairman of the Board?—The union advises him.

130. Do you think that is proper?—Most decidedly

131. Would you be satisfied with the Stipendiary Magistrate of the district as the Chairman of the Board?—I am not acquainted with the gentleman.