

And in cross-examination he said that there may have been some small discussion at the earlier meeting, but the major discussion was at the meeting on the 15th January (Minute No. 1453).

The Deputy Chairman, Mr. Young, said there was quite a considerable amount of discussion. The General Manager gave very fully his reasons in support of his recommendation. The witness thought that the discussion was at the first and not the second meeting, and then appears to qualify his answer on cross-examination when he said, "Those aspects were fully considered, but when I say 'considered' I am not prepared to say at this stage to what extent they were considered."

Mr. Ewen's evidence was very indefinite. His recollection was that the tenders should be called for in lots, but cannot remember exactly whether there was any discussion as to how the lots should be divided. Mr. Hutchings said he thought the Board dealt with the question of whether tenders should be invited for a smaller number of vehicles than each trade-mark, but he cannot say at which meeting; he also thought that the whole position was considered again after the December meeting, and further on he said he did himself consider the proposition of dividing the G.M.C. trucks into a smaller number of fairly large lots.

The Secretary, Mr. Conibear, said the discussion took place at both meetings. The General Manager's recommendation was that the motor-vehicles be sold by tender in one lot or in lots according to trade-mark, and supported his recommendation with reasons and there was a discussion on the point. It will be seen there is some slight conflict between the evidence of the General Manager and the Secretary, the former stating the discussion was at the second meeting, and the latter stating it took place at both meetings. It would not be fair to conclude that, because the recollection of the members of the Board is somewhat faulty and indefinite as to details of a transaction some six to eight months ago, and which is only one of very many they have to deal with, that due consideration as stated by the General Manager and the Secretary was not given to this subject.

Dealing now with the question of selling in smaller lots.

The weight of evidence is against the feasibility of selling in smaller lots or of selling the G.M.C.s in five separate lots, and in this connection the evidence of the successful tenderers, Carter and Gillies, who have actual working experience in the park, is of special value.

Carter states that the difficulties are that there was not room there to do it. You could not have different gangs of men working there. They would have been on top of one another. There would have been chaos in the place. There were Jeeps parked inside G.M.C.s which had tires deflated and brakes all seized up. You could not move some of them. He did not think it could have been done without moving the whole lot, which would have been a tremendous undertaking. You would want a big plot where you could put them into smaller lots to get round them, and would involve a complete sorting out of the vehicles.

Gillies said that with five lots he would not have liked to be one of the tenderers. With five working together in the park you are asking the impossible. Shifting the vehicles would be a tremendous job. A lot of the vehicles are lying in water, seized up completely in the brake-drums, and you have to lift them out with a crane.

Warner agrees with the above views, and says there would be chaos.