

24. Do you think those three words "he thinks fit" imply that the motorman can make any report as to matters as they appear to him?—I think he has to report in the book anything that is not all right in the car.

25. To use his own language and judgment?—Yes, I think that is essential, that a man should use his own language.

26. Do you think the men are now making a fair and impartial report on the mechanism and equipment of the cars?—I think so. Of course, there are some motormen who would be careless at any time; but, generally speaking, I think the men make fairly accurate reports. The more experience a man has, the more fully he reports.

27. I think you stated that you reported defective equipment, and it was not attended to?—That is so.

28. Was the car running all the time?—Yes, it was not laid up.

29. What was the number of the car?—No. 92.

30. What was the nature of the defect?—A stiff track and ratchet staff.

31. How long would it take for that car to be in the repair-shop and have the necessary repairs effected?—It could be done in two hours.

32. Did the management know that you had an accident through that defect?—I reported it in a full report on an independent sheet to the traffic superintendent.

33. Did he sign your report?—I never saw it again.

34. It was some one's duty to sign it if you made it, was it not?—There were two reports put in over that. On the loose-leaf car-defect sheet I reported the car, and also ran it in on the Tuesday or Wednesday previously, for this defect; but it was brought out half an hour afterwards, and I was informed by the barn hands that they could not do anything with it—it would have to wear easy. That was on the Tuesday or Wednesday previous to the 10th March last.

35. Do you consider that car No. 92 was fit to be run with safety to the public while in that state?—No. It was booked unfit for traffic by my relief mate on the Tuesday or Wednesday.

36. Did they pay you any compensation while you were off work?—No, I applied for it.

37. Are you entitled to it?—I thought I was.

38. Did you prosecute your claim further than by asking for it?—No. I did not prosecute—it is against my principles.

39. Did they give you any reason for not paying you compensation?—They sent me a note stating that they were not liable.

40. You did not appeal to their appeal board?—I did not say anything more about it.

41. Can you give us any reason for not following it up?—I am a Christian man, and I did not follow it up.

42. Do you not think you have a right as a Christian to do so?—That is my opinion.

43. What do you think of the Auckland appeal board—do you think it is a fair and impartial one?—No, it is a partial appeal board.

44. Can you give the Committee any case in point to justify what you say?—I gave the Tickell case the other day. I was on that case, and the chairman, Mr Rhodes, did not want to accede to the request of the union and dismiss this man, though it was proved to be a misstatement he had made in order to secure a conviction against a man he reported, but under a threat from the union the management admitted that he had made a misstatement, and had to dispense with his services.

45. Under the threat from the union?—Yes, that they would put into effect the award under which we worked—the award of 1908 I think it was. There is a clause in that which states that any inspector making a false report or misstatement should be instantly dismissed.

46. And so this man was dismissed?—Yes.

47. Clause 3 of the Bill, "Inspection of tramways": Do you think such an inspection as is provided for there would be an advantage or a disadvantage to the public or to the employees?—It would be a distinct advantage.

48. Do you think it would provide a further margin of safety for the public?—Yes, a very important one, I think.

49. I think you said you were well acquainted with a motorman who was concerned in the Kingsland accident?—Yes.

50. Do you think it was the fault of the motorman or the brake, or a pure accident?—The brakes were a contributive cause, but the inefficiency of the motorman was the principal cause. That was the car where the brakes failed with me in the test on two consecutive days. That is car No. 39.

51. Was that previous to the runaway?—Yes.

52. What training did that motorman have?—He had training with a man named Barnes, but I could not say how much. At that time it was usual to give ten or twelve days.

53. Do you think that motorman had had sufficient training?—No.

54. Do you think he would get a Government certificate if he went up under this Bill?—It would be quite impossible, if judged by a competent man.

55. So that if this Bill becomes law an incompetent motorman would not so easily get a certificate as he does now when licensed by the Corporation?—No.

56. Do you think it would be advisable to amend this Bill so as to make the examinations stiffer?—Does your question imply that the holder of a license at the present time should be re-examined?

57. It is this: All the motormen employed for twelve months will be entitled to a certificate in competency or service, and I propose that they must prove to the Board that they have been employed over a certain period: do you think that would make the examinations more satisfactory?—Yes. That is what we need to make the standard high enough.