

31. The man was taken that the Department considered best qualified?—That must have been the reason why the Department took him. That is what we complain of—that in some of these cases, at all events, the men who are passed over because the Department does not consider they are qualified do not get an explanation of the reason.

32. Did any man who was passed over appeal?—Yes, one.

33. What was the result?—The result was that he tried to conduct his own case and failed.

34. Is it not a fact that he withdrew his appeal?—Yes, he failed to establish his case, and he withdrew.

35. He asked permission to withdraw?—I do not know whether he asked permission, but he withdrew it.

36. Well, others had the same opportunity?—They did.

37. And did not avail themselves of it?—No. There was one who asked for leave to appeal, but he had allowed the time to elapse, and was not granted leave, I believe, until later on.

38. Is it not a fact that this officer was told he could appeal and he did not do so; then subsequently he was told he could appeal and did not take advantage of it?—Yes, I believe that is the position.

39. Have you got any other cases?—No, I am not prepared to quote any other cases.

40. Those are five cases you have quoted?—I look upon them as two or three.

41. Very well, you quote those two cases to substantiate a general statement that the system of promotion in the Railway service is defective by reason of the fact that efficient officers have been superseded by junior officers without a satisfactory reason being given to the officers who have been superseded. You have admitted that one man appealed and then withdrew the appeal, and that another man had an opportunity and did not go on with it?—Yes, that is so.

42. Is it within your knowledge, Mr. Morgan, that officers in charge of men are invited by the Department to make recommendations annually in respect to the various men under them?—They are.

43. You are aware that is a fact?—Yes.

44. Can you say from your own personal knowledge if it is done—you worked under the supervision of the Stationmaster in Dunedin?—Yes.

45. Can you say whether he reviewed his staff and sent reports in?—Yes.

46. *Hon. Mr. Millar.*] You said an officer stated that he was afraid of appealing because the Appeal Board's decision would be vetoed?—That was the impression he conveyed to me.

47. Will you say how often a recommendation has been vetoed since the Appeal Board has been in existence?—No, I cannot.

48. Can you quote any case where the recommendation of the Appeal Board has been vetoed?—I cannot quote any case from my own personal knowledge.

49. Do you think it would be proper to hand over the control of the public purse to two junior officers of the Railway Department?—No, I do not think so.

50. Well, that would be the effect if the Minister had not the power of veto, and if the veto was taken away the control would have to be placed outside the Railway Department altogether?—I do not think that.

51. *Mr. Brown.*] In the course of evidence it came out that a man had been raised to a grade above owing to his having been ill, and he was ordered to a certain position where the climate might suit his health. Was that one of those men you referred to, Nos. 3, 9, 11, and 15?—No, that is not so.

52. *Mr. Ross.*] Are the officers or is the management responsible for the composition of the Appeal Board?—The Board was first of all set up by Parliament, I understand—they provided the machinery.

53. And consequently Parliament and the management is responsible for the composition of the Board, and not the officers?—I do not exactly see that the management are any more involved than the officers if Parliament set the Appeal Board up, as, of course, we know they did.

54. *Hon. Mr. Millar.*] The members of the Appeal Board are elected?—Yes.

55. *Mr. Ross.*] Then the Minister and the Government are responsible for the composition of the Appeal Board?—Yes, it amounts to that.

56. When the Minister asked you if you thought the Government would be justified in handing over the public purse to two junior officers in the Railway service, is that any fault of the officers that that position has been brought about?—No.

57. The responsibility was brought about by Parliament?—Yes.

58. *Hon. Mr. Millar.*] Parliament gave the power of veto, did it not?—Yes.

59. *The Chairman.*] Have the Railway employees, in your opinion, confidence in the Appeal Board?—Not as it is at present constituted.

60. Do you know if any fear exists amongst the men in the service of their being marked men if they appeal and if they oppose the Department before the Appeal Board?—No, I do not think such a feeling exists.

61. At any rate, in the First Division you do not think it exists?—No.

62. Well, should the present constitution of the Appeal Board be altered in your opinion and in the opinion of the Officers' Institute?—Yes, we consider it should be.

63. *Hon. Mr. Millar.*] Will you give us your idea of how the Board ought to be constituted?—Equal representation from the management and the staff, with a Judge of the Supreme Court to preside. The management have no representation on the Board now. You have some one to appear for you, but no representation on the Board.

64. That is to say, No. 1 Division and the management would have their own representatives on the Board, and the Second Division would appoint another representative?—Yes. We do not consider we have any right to ask for the abolition of the veto unless the Board were so constituted that the management were represented.