

66. Speaking of your own period of management, have you honestly endeavoured to meet the reasonable requirements of the traffic?—We have.

67. And, in addition to that, have you received occasional prods from the Auckland City Council?—We have.

68. And have you complied—I do not mean immediately, but substantially—with anything they have demanded for the purpose, as they stated, of meeting the reasonable requirements of the traffic?—We have at the earliest possible moment.

69. Is the supervision of the Auckland City Council, so far as the reasonable requirements of the traffic is concerned, a real or nominal supervision?—Very real, inasmuch as they employ a man to watch the requirements of the traffic.

70. And, apart from the supervision and the prodding of the Auckland City Council, is it not to your own interests to meet the reasonable requirements of the traffic?—Undoubtedly it is: that is what the service is for.

71. So far as the question of public safety is concerned, have you any objection to the Government having full supervision of the tramways?—None whatever, because I assume they have at the present moment, under the Public Works Act.

72. Do you distinguish, under clause 3 of the Bill, between what is required for the public safety and the reasonable requirements of the traffic?—Yes, I consider they are two totally different requirements. The one—the requirements of the traffic—is a requirement that can only be satisfactorily dealt with by the local people, for the reason that they are there, and have the means of ascertaining the requirements.

73. Do you find that whenever the Auckland people require any more cars and so on, they are at all backward in making their views public?—No, they are not.

74. And it is public opinion you have to satisfy?—That is so.

75. Do you see any difficulty—I am speaking now only on the question of the reasonable requirements of the traffic—that is likely to arise if this section is passed, from the dual control of Minister and Auckland City Council?—Well, we should be placed in the great difficulty that, whereas under our deeds of delegation we are bound to meet the reasonable requirements of the traffic as set out by the Auckland City Council from time to time, under the Bill we should have another standard to meet.

76. You might therefore have two standards to meet which might be quite different one from the other?—That is so.

77. If this Bill is to become law, do you ask that provision should be made in it so that you would only have to meet the requirements of the Minister, and not the requirements of the Auckland City Council?—Yes, but the requirements of the Auckland City Council are subject to revision by the Courts, while clause 3 of the Bill apparently—as far as I can read it—admits of absolutely no appeal of any kind. It is very wide.

78. Have you ever in the whole of your tramway experience ever heard of any one person having such powers—I am still keeping to the requirements of the traffic—as are sought by the Minister in this Bill?—No.

79. In what countries have you had experience?—Mainly in the United Kingdom, but elsewhere in Australia and other places. I have never come across a tramway where the requirements of the traffic were in the hands of one individual. They are almost invariably subject to public will of some sort.

80. Do you think that the power which is given in this clause is a proper power to give to any one man without any right of appeal whatever?—I do not think so.

81. Have you anything else you desire to say with regard to clause 3 of the Bill?—No, excepting that similar wide power is also held to apply to alterations and additions to plant, and that again is almost unlimited in its scope.

82. Can you say, for instance, that you might be ordered under this clause, without any right of appeal, to provide, say, double the number of cars which you think necessary, or the Auckland City Council think necessary, for the reasonable requirements of the traffic?—Yes, apparently we might be required to do anything. It is unlimited.

83. Now, as to clause 4?—There is no objection to that. That is already the practice.

84. As a preliminary matter to clause 5, I just want to get the routine with regard to the inspection and licensing of cars: In the first place, before you have a car made, do you have to submit your plans of that car to the Public Works Department?—We do.

85. To be approved by whom?—By the Department—I think the Engineer-in-Chief.

86. Then after you have your car manufactured and before you are allowed to put it on the road, is it inspected?—It is. Before we are allowed to ply for passengers it is inspected by an officer of the Public Works Department.

87. An officer on the engineering staff?—Yes.

88. I suppose that would be the Resident Engineer?—Generally the District Engineer.

89. And does he inspect the car merely to see whether it conforms to the design, or does he inspect it generally apart from its design?—He inspects it to see if it conforms with the design submitted, and he tests it also on the road with brakes and otherwise.

90. Then may the Committee take it that every car you have on the road in Auckland has undergone that test?—They have, all of them.

91. In addition to the inspection by an officer of the Public Works Department, is there any inspection by the Auckland City Council or any of its officers?—They are inspected by the Auckland City Council—the City Engineer and Traffic Inspector—before a license is issued.

92. And before you run the car you have to get a license from the City Council pursuant to the terms of your deed of delegation?—That is so.