

rails without so much inconvenience, but from the railway point of view the practice is always more or less objectionable. It is not impossible at Foxton, but most objectionable. Nothing is impossible if you choose to take three days in discharging a ship by barrowing when it should only take one to discharge with other methods.

20. *Mr. Myers.*] Well, is it practicable?—It is inadvisable.

21. Is there anything further you desire to say in regard to the Foxton Wharf?—I think not. I think the ground has been very fully covered by Mr. McVilly and previous witnesses.

22. *Mr. Williams.*] With regard to your line at the Foxton Wharf, could it be removed by recasting the arrangements?—No; I do not think it would be practicable to recast the arrangements. The extent of land available is so narrow that it would be a very difficult and most expensive matter to recast the wharf.

23. *Mr. Myers.*] I want you to come now to the suggestion of a new line of railway between Levin and Marton. First of all, speaking generally, do you agree with what Mr. McVilly has said?—Yes, I do. Perhaps it would be better to take some of the points more in detail, but I entirely agree with his evidence.

24. One point that Mr. McVilly did not seem to deal with in his estimates of the increase of the working-expenses was the cost of rolling-stock equipment?—Yes.

25. Would there be any such increase of expenditure?—There must, of course, be increased expenditure on rolling-stock if the mileage of railway is increased, either as a siding or a through line.

26. First of all I am taking the through line from Marton to Levin?—Undoubtedly this would involve an increase of rolling-stock—that is, presuming the line did not belong to us.

27. No, I am presuming the line does belong to you and you are working a through line from Wellington to Auckland and also working the Palmerston North—Marton Section separately?—Well, of course, when any new line is under consideration involving additional mileage it is necessary to include in the estimate of expenditure a figure representing the additional rolling-stock which would be required.

28. And that is not included in the cost of the railway that has been mentioned by Mr. Holmes and Mr. Maclean?—No. It would be very difficult to estimate the figure until the nature and volume of traffic over the new line has been defined: these factors govern the rolling-stock requirements. It would scarcely be possible to give any estimate at present as to cost of additional rolling-stock required.

29. Perhaps you could say whether it is a negligible matter or a matter that is material?—It would be quite a material figure. Taking the proposal in its simplest form—that is, that the line should be extended to Marton as a dead-ended line, with a connection or without a connection—

30. Now you are speaking of the tramway?—Yes; the tramway people would obviously have to add to their rolling-stock if they extended the distance of their carry.

31. Unless they could get it from you?—Yes, unless they got it from us. And if they came into competition with us it is not to be supposed that we are going to give them all the weapons. If a man starts business in competition with another in the same street he does not generally come along and ask his rival in trade to do the cartage to his customers. That is very much what this application is. If the tramway is going to become a competitor it cannot expect rolling-stock from us.

32. So that, apart from the actual cost of the extension, they would have to provide rolling-stock?—Yes, if we regarded them as competitors; and, of course, if they actually junctioned up with us the question of their providing rolling-stock, and the terms under which it could be allowed on the Government railways, would require very serious consideration. How should we treat it? If the tramway are contemplating providing stock, as suggested, sufficiently strong to carry the goods over their line, but sufficiently light so as not to break it, we should have a very serious objection to mixing such rolling-stock up with our own. Tramway-wagons would be loaded and consigned for long distances over the Government railways, and the tramway people would expect that rolling-stock back on their line as quickly as possible, and as we should get a few loads back to the tramway it would mean empty haulage in practically every case. They could not expect the Railway Department to enter into reciprocal demurrage arrangements with them, although we should have to charge them demurrage for any Government wagons that went on their line so as to get them back promptly. The tramway would not incur any long-distance haulage in returning Government wagons to the nearest junction. If they are going to charge us demurrage after two or three days allowed for getting that wagon to its destination—say Auckland, for example—we should be subsidizing the tramway by paying heavy demurrage charges on a truck, which would be of no use to us, until we had hauled it back to the tramway junction again. The cost to the tramway of providing sufficient rolling-stock, without the use of Government wagons, would be prohibitive.

33. In any case they would not be likely to get trucks on the same terms at that end as at the Himatangi end?—I do not think they are very likely to get trucks on present terms at either end again in any new agreement. That was an oversight.

34. Is there anything further you would like to say with regard to the rolling-stock?—Not in regard to the rolling-stock.

35. I understand, first of all, that you object to any physical connection between the tramway and the railway at Marton or Greatford, or in the neighbourhood?—Yes.

36. Well, do you desire to say anything on that particular head?—Our objection is quite legitimate and quite obvious. There is in the first place the operating objection to having trains hauled by men whom the Department do not control and do not examine, into a busy yard such as Marton is, amongst men who have to come up to a higher standard of efficiency. It is bringing in a new element of danger both to the staff and the travelling public. Therefore any railway connection of that kind is objectionable from the point of view of safety. But, apart from that, there is the legitimate objection of the Department to competitors coming along and saying, "Well, we see this is a good point at which to