

42. You do not believe apparently in trusting the people and the representatives of the people?—In connection with tramways I think it requires independent expert knowledge which does not obtain in a body of commercial men.

43. Can you tell me of a single expert in tramway matters in this Dominion outside of those who are at present engaged in the management of the existing tramway system?—That is a hard question for a layman. I know there is one gentleman in New Zealand—Mr Chamberlain—who is a good one.

44. Do you know of any one in the Government service at the present time who is an expert in tramway matters?—I should like you to leave that question until I think it over. I have not considered such a thing. I am not sufficiently well acquainted with these things.

45. How long have you been training motormen in Auckland?—Since I came to Auckland, at the inauguration of the system.

46. Who was the driver of the car in the Kingsland accident?—Humphreys.

47. Who trained him?—A man named Barnes.

48. Was he a man who had been a motorman for some time?—Yes. I think he came from Queensland.

49. Was he a competent man?—I do not know. Yes, I think he was.

50. This man Humphreys had been driving for six months?—I do not think he had been driving very long.

51. If Mr Richardson said it was about six months, would that be correct?—I could not say.

52. You ventured the statement yesterday—not the opinion—that the motorman did not lose his head: how do you know?—I ventured the statement that the cause of the accident was that he had not been competently trained, and that was the cause of the accident.

53. When I asked you whether Barnes was competent to train, you said you did not know?—Yes.

54. And yet, not knowing whether Barnes was competent to train or not, and knowing that he did train this man, you say the man was inefficiently trained?—Yes.

55. How do you know, inasmuch as you make the statement and confine yourself to the mere opinion that Humphreys did not lose his head?—I said the cause of the accident was through his being inefficiently trained.

56. Do you think it possible that he might have lost his head?—I could not say.

57. Would you mind telling me whether you think the men who undergo training for motormen in Auckland now?—I think they are at the present time.

58. And I suppose that statement will hold good for some time back?—If you will just allow me to explain here a case. An Inspector has recently been appointed from the conductor's rank. He is put through, and has no difficulty whatever with his examinations. As a general rule I think it would apply for some time back.

59. Should I be right in saying, for some years back?—No.

60. For how long, then?—I could not say how long.

61. You have been watching tramway affairs in Auckland?—Yes, right from the commencement.

62. Cannot you tell the Committee for what time back the men have been efficiently trained?—There might be cases right from the commencement, and then there are other cases where the men have not been properly trained.

63. I want you to say for what time back the men as a whole have been efficiently trained?—I could not state the time.

64. Well, if the men are being efficiently trained now, and have been for some time back, although you cannot say how long, what on earth is the use of a Government certificate?—To give a proper standard of examination; to certify to the fact that a man is a competent motorman, and, in addition to what I said yesterday, to prevent the giving of an examination to suit a relation of any of the employers in the company—to make it easy or to make it unduly hard for a man they do not want to go through.

65. Well, your observations apply just as well to a company as to a municipality?—I have not considered municipalities.

66. You said that Mr Rockland had put a man through an examination which was severe enough for an electrical engineer who had a motorman's experience: is Mr Rockland an electrical engineer?—I do not think I said those words. I said yesterday, as far as I can remember, the animus of the motor-inspector prevented Houghton getting a proper test or a proper examination. I do not wish for a moment to infer that he had examined him, but he was on the car when the man was put through his examination by Mr Brennand.

67. Against whom do you make the charge of unfairness—Mr Brennand, or Mr Rockland, or both?—Mr. Brennand conducts it.

68. Do you then make the charge against Mr Brennand as well as Mr Rockland?—I say it was unfair.

69. Then I may take it that you charge Mr Brennand also: do you suggest animus on the part of Mr Brennand?—No; he is a fine fellow. I worked with him for years.

70. He was the person who conducted the examination?—Exactly.

71. Then why do you suggest that he put this man Houghton through the severe test you describe?—My opinion is that the examination should be carried out by the man in charge, not by having three or four others to assist to do things to a car to get defects and to muddle the candidate.

72. Why do you suggest that Mr Brennand, who is a fine fellow, should be under the influence of others?—Under the influence of those on the car.

73. Do you mean Mr Rockland?—Yes.