The Committee are of opinion that such a Board would claim the respect and confidence of all sections of employers and workers. It must be admitted that many of the recommendations made by the Boards of Conciliation under the existing Act have been inconsistent with the evidence given, and that the Court of Arbitration has taken little or no notice of the recommendations, but have found it necessary to start inquiry without reference to evidence in the lower Court. The Committee wish to say that they do not attribute this in any way to lack of interest on the part of the Boards, but to the fact that they are not, from want of technical knowledge, able to deal effectively with the disputes in question.

The Committee think that if the constitution of the Boards was fixed on the lines suggested above, it would be necessary for all documents and evidence produced in the lower Court to be available for the Court of Arbitration; otherwise they think the report useless.

The Committee are of opinion that, especially in connection with awards referring to the production of interchangeable goods, it is absolutely necessary that uniform conditions should prevail throughout the colony, and a special clause should be inserted in the Bill giving the Court of Arbitration power to fix an award which would apply to all workers and employers throughout the colony.

Clause 2, Subsection (d).—The Committee suggest that the Bill should make it clear that if preference of employment is given to members of the union of workmen, preference of service should be given by unions of workmen to unions of employers.

Clause 2, Subsection (e).—The clause appears to cover all classes of employers and all classes of workers of either sex, but the Committee think that it should make it clear that all work done in connection with any particular business, trade, manufacture, undertaking, calling, or employment in which an award has been made, should be subject to the conditions of work and rates of pay ruling under the award, whether or not the parties engaged in such work have been made parties to the award, or whether they are union or non-union, and that the same penalties for any breach of the award should apply to all workers and employers in that particular industry.

Clause 12, Subsection (2).—This does not appear to the Committee to be quite clear. If it is intended to mean that no unions of workmen, or individual member of a union of workmen, can carry on trading, manufacturing, or mercantile operations, or any operations for pecuniary gain, and retain his membership of such union, we consider this to be a very good provision.

Clause 17 (1).—The work of compiling the returns in the larger associations is enormous, and the Committee submit that the forwarding of the returns to the Registrar once every twelve months should be sufficient for all purposes of the Act.

Clause 17, Subsection (5).—The Committee think this subsection should be struck out, on the ground that the organization is admitted by the Registrar, that he is supplied with the name and address of the executive officer, and that the penalty provided in subsection (4) should be sufficient to ensure the Act being complied with.

Clause 21.—The Committee think this clause should be amended in respect to employers, owing to the fact that the number of employers necessary to form a union is large compared with the smaller number of men, and to insist upon four industrial unions of employers to form an industrial association might prevent industrial associations of employers being formed, which evidently is not the intention of the Bill. And the Committee's proposal is not inconsistent with Clause 5 of the Bill, which provides that a less number of employers can form a union than of workers. Suggest that three unions of employers be sufficient to form an association.

Clause 41, Subsection (4).—The Committee suggest that all the words after "imprisonment" should be struck out, on the ground that any man who commits an offence punishable by imprisonment for any term is not a fit and proper person to administer justice.

Clause 41, Subsection (5).—The Committee suggest that after the word "vacant" the following should be added:—"Unless he has the permission of the Board for absence for a period not exceeding three months."

Clause 86, Subsection (3), Line 5.—The Committee recommend that the word "or" should be struck out, and that, after "employer," "or workmen" should be added.

The Committee suggest that in addition to the official copy deposited with the Registrar, giving the recommendation of the Board of Conciliation, or the award of the Court of Arbitration, as the case may be, a copy should be given to the parties before the Board or Court, signed by the Registrar as a correct copy of the document filed. The present arrangement of taking a copy at the Court is most inconvenient, and should be altered.

The Committee consider that the term of office of the Board and Court is far too short. They recommend six years in preference to three years. It takes a considerable time for members of either the Board or Court to thoroughly grasp the work in connection with the administration of the Act, and the liability to change at frequent intervals is considered unwise.

The Committee recommend that provision should be made in the Bill that evidence of a technical and private character led by either party should be considered confidential, and not be reported in the public Press.

The Committee draw attention to the inconvenience sometimes caused by only three days being given by the Registrar to parties to appear before the Board or Court. A much longer notice should be given, certainly not less than twenty-one days, and that the notice to appear should contain a copy of the plaint.

The Canterbury Employers' Association desire to impress upon the Government that they are thoroughly in accord with the principles laid down in the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Any hostility they may have shown in the past was mainly due to the fact that the Act was made to apply to a certain section of the industrial community only. The Government now propose to remove this, and, if the Bill now before the House is amended in the directions suggested by the Association, they are strongly of opinion that it would be impossible to conceive of a more useful measure, properly administered, that would prove of such immense benefit to all sections of the industrial community, and, with this in view, the Association urge upon the Government to reconsider their determination not to allow the Act to apply to all workers under the Crown.

JAS. A. FROSTICK, President Canterbury Employers' Association.

Christchurch, 9th July, 1900.

ALLAN ORR in attendance and examined. (No. 4.)

1. *The Chairman.*]—Your name is Allan Orr?—Yes.

2. You represent the Wellington Drivers' Union?—Yes.

3. You desire to give evidence on some new matters contained in this Bill?—Yes, sir. There is one matter, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that materially affects us. We are one of those unions not properly recognised as such. We are going before the Arbitration Court on Monday next, and we are in this position: We will be debarred from any further benefits, and simply thrown back into our original position. My union instructed me to ask the Committee that recommendation be made that where a union has gone before the Conciliation Board it shall not be compelled to go on to the Court until the Act is amended. Our union spent between £50 and £60 when before the Conciliation Board, and the employers probably spent a similar amount, and we failed to fall in with the recommendations of the Board. Whilst it cost us that amount, it cost the Government between £100 and £200. Now, we wish Mr. Justice Martin to adjourn our case in order that it may come on when the Act is amended.

4. You desire to go to the Court direct without going to the Board at all? You want a special clause put in the Act?—I think that either the employers or the employés should go to the Arbitration Court without going back to the Conciliation Board. It would prevent friction, providing that that option were given. There is one matter which my union is very strong on—with regard to preference, as, of course, all unions are. We feel that the preference clause is to a great extent the backbone of the unions. In speaking on the preference clause in Reefton, the late