

'signing off' means the reporting the condition of the car as the man leaves it. There were delays caused in this way that a motorman might have four or five defects to book up against the car, and as five or six motormen would come in within two or three minutes and all would want to sign off practically at the same time, there would be delays, where a man might only want to sign off "O.K.," meaning that his car was all right. Delays of five or six minutes have been caused through that system.

97. Under the system proposed there would be no delays, because the men would get their book for each car?—Yes, I approve of that. The present way of doing it is a good system, but I should like to see every car-defect sheet numbered, and in the event of a serious accident the motorman concerned or an official or officials of the union should have the right of access to the bookings of the car.

98. That is contained in the clause?—At present there is no means of finding or tracing the record of the car.

99. You believe that the union officials should have the right to inspect the book?—I think so.

100. Is there anything else you want to say in respect of the Bill?—I do not think so.

101. *Mr. M. Myers.*] You think there should be an Appeal Board?—Yes.

102. Is it your opinion that in the case of private employers there should also be an Appeal Board? A merchant has a number of men in his employment, and disrates or discharges one of his men—do you think that man should have the right of appeal to an Appeal Board?—I do not think that is really a good comparison. You cannot compare public work with private work.

103. Take a large factory: do you think a person disrated or discharged from his employment in that factory should have the right of appeal to an Appeal Board?—A public servant has more to deal with than a private person, and I do not think the claims are the same.

104. Do you think a person on board ship, be he an officer or one of the men, should have the right of appeal on being disrated or discharged?—As far as my knowledge goes, I think they have some right of appeal.

105. Do you think they should have it?—My knowledge of shipping work is small, and I should not like to give an opinion.

106. Do you know whether the Railway employees are satisfied with their right of appeal to an Appeal Board?—I cannot say.

107. Do you not know that they are very dissatisfied?—No. Still, I think they are every bit as much entitled to an Appeal Board, properly constituted, as we are.

108. Without the right of veto? The Minister has the right to refuse to carry out the finding of the Appeal Board?—Yes, I know that, but still I think it is left in pretty good hands.

109. Would you be satisfied if the City Council, in the case of the municipally owned tramways, had the right of veto?—No. I have in my official position as president of the union come in contact with municipally owned tramways, and I think they are little better off than we are as a private concern—that is to say, the promotions are unsatisfactory.

110. You will agree with this, will you not: that the owners of the tramways, whoever they are, have to take responsibility for the men whom they employ?—They take responsibility, that is true, but my opinion is that they evade responsibility as much as possible.

111. If an accident is caused by negligence, the owners of the tramways are responsible?—Yes.

112. Do you not think that the people who have to take the responsibility should be the best judges of the men they should employ?—Having practical knowledge, I say unquestionably No.

113. Supposing there were an Appeal Board set up, would you be satisfied if that Appeal Board should be the Arbitration Court Boards?—No.

114. Why not?—My reason for saying that is this. The Arbitration Court consist of an employees' representative and an employers' representative, together with the Supreme Court Judge as Chairman. I think personally that a better Chairman in a case of this description could be obtained by a selection between the two representatives, and, failing that, by the Government, and the Supreme Court Judge on those particular cases in which we make an appeal.

115. Do you not think the Arbitration Court would be a fair tribunal if there is to be a fair tribunal?—My personal opinion is that it would not be so.

116. What objection have you to the Arbitration Court on the ground of unfairness?—My opinion is that the Supreme Court Judge looks too much at the legal aspect and not enough at equity and justice.

117. Would you be satisfied that the Chairman of the Appeal Board—if there is to be one—should be the Stipendiary Magistrate for the district, instead of being a person to be appointed by the Minister?—No, I would rather see the clause as it stands, that there should be an amicable arrangement if possible, and, failing that, that the Government should step in and make the selection of the Chairman.

118. You remember the case of the special Board appointed in 1908, and you say that the conductor's view was upheld by that Board?—Yes.

119. Do you know that the Arbitration Court subsequently stated that the finding of the Chairman on that Board was wrong?—No, I have not heard of it. I should expect it.

120. Why should you expect it?—For the reason that I have given, that a Supreme Court Judge looks too much at the legal aspect, and not enough at equity and justice.

121. But you know the man was a lawyer who gave that decision?—That is so.

122. Can you not see that the findings of an Appeal Board might place the owners of a tramway in a most unfortunate position by forcing upon them a man they thought was incompetent?—No. My opinion is this: that the union, we will say, in making the selection of a representative would unquestionably select a fair-minded man.