

47. Was this blocked on in advance?—No.

48. Therefore some one was breaking the regulations?—That is so.

49. You are aware there are no distance signals at New Lynn Station?—Yes.

50. Has your association asked for any distance signals to be put at any stations for the safety of the public?—Yes, my association has approached the management and asked for distance signals to be placed at all stations, especially on the Main Trunk line.

51. What reply did you get?—I think we had a reasonable reply from the management. They asked us to mention the particular stations where we wanted the distance signals. It was a general request that the drivers would like distance signals at all stations. It would be a great boon to all drivers, but the management seemed to think, and reasonably so, perhaps, that the cost was great, and they asked us to enumerate the stations at which we wanted them.

52. Do you consider it was right to remove this signal to the bridge without placing a distance signal on Scroggy Hill?—I would not like to pronounce judgment on that. It would be a great advantage to have a distance signal at New Lynn.

53. Do you consider that the engine-driver had had sufficient experience to be placed on the train that morning?—He had sufficient experience in clear weather, but I must say that in running his train in a fog, owing to his youth and lack of experience and the very few times he had run on that road, and the great distance of time that had elapsed between each trip, he was placed in a most unfortunate position.

54. *Mr. Green.*] After seeing the plan and the curve, do you think the home signal is too near the station?—I think that if the regulations provided by the Railway Department were carried out the signal where it is is all right.

55. Have you ever known an emergency man being called upon to assist the tablet porter or the Stationmaster at any station when a fog is existing like the one that morning?—I have no experience with regard to station-work.

56. Had you been in the driver's place that morning with the fog would you have expected to have found detonators?—Not working on the Auckland Section, I should have expected it.

57. You think it would have been safer for the public?—I have no hesitation in saying that they would have prevented the collision.

58. *Mr. McVilly.*] With respect to the efficiency of fog-signals, if the driver of No. 6 had complied with Rule 82 and stopped short of the home signal would the collision have occurred?—No.

59. Then the driver of No. 6 had it at his own door to prevent the collision irrespective of fog-signals or anything else, had he not?—There are a large number of rules, and if they had been applied they would have prevented the collision.

60. Rule 82 is that the home signal must not be passed at "Danger"?—Yes, if he had complied with that rule.

61. *Mr. Hine.*] Then in that case detonators are not wanted if they comply with the rule?—If the driver could always see the signal, and stopped, there would have never been such a rule in the book as fog-signalling.

62. What is the reason of the rule?—The reason of detonators being mentioned in the rule-book is that the compilers of the book have recognized that in a fog a driver was likely to over-run his signal through not being able to use his visionary powers. Therefore they provided detonators that would give him a warning in another way.

63. *Mr. Dickson.*] Really Rule 82 only applies to clear weather?—It would apply when you cannot see the signal. The Department recognizes that by instituting fog-signals.

64. *Mr. McVilly.*] Do you know the rule which provides that in the absence of a signal it has in all cases to be taken as "Danger"?—Yes, there is a rule to that effect.

65. If the driver could not see the home signal he should have taken it as a "Danger" signal and stopped?—If he knew he was there.

66. If he could see it 30 yards away he should have had the train under control under Rule 211?—Yes, if he knew he was getting near.

67. *Mr. Dickson.*] You said he could pull his train up in 600 ft.?—I said I was guessing that.

68. Supposing he saw this signal 30 yards away, that would be 90 ft.?—He said that was on an angle.

69. Therefore he did not have an opportunity of pulling up in the 600 ft.?—Yes, he collided before the time elapsed.

70. Therefore that particular rule could not apply in this particular case?—No.

71. *Mr. Sykes.*] Was New Lynn mentioned as a station where distance signals should be provided?—I have no recollection of any station being mentioned before the collision. Our secretary would be able to prove that.

72. Do you know if he made certain suggestions on behalf of the association?—Probably that would be after the New Lynn collision, because the request was a general one before that. I am not in a position to say. The information could be obtained from our general secretary.

73. *The Chairman.*] According to the evidence you have heard, do you think it was possible for the "Danger" signal to be seen?—According to the evidence there was a very dense fog that morning, and it would not be possible to see the signal.

74. If he could not see the signal was it his duty to pull up?—If he knew where he was; in fact, it would have been wise in any case.

75. Do you think there was any attempt made to pull up before the collision?—I think the driver had his train under control and was watching to see the signal and to stop if it was at "Danger."

76. *Mr. Mack.*] Is it not a fact that if the rules were complied with with regard to fog-signalling the driver would lose time?—It is not my experience.