

17. You admit that the Auckland work is ill finished, is not done with the same exercise of skill as it is in the South, and that many little items that go to set off the work are left out, and, putting it plainly, the work is "cheap and nasty"?—Yes, that is just it exactly. Good first-class work is done in the South.

18. And you say there is no really good work done in Auckland?—No, sir, there is not.

19. *The Chairman.*] In cutting out coats, how much of the work is done before you give them out?—The trimmings are put into them, and the pockets are chalk-marked.

20. The girls have to cut the pockets themselves?—Yes.

21. *Mr. Laurensen.*] Do they cut out the linings?—No, these are put in and the girl has to trim it and make one piece fit in with another.

22. *Mr. Arnold.*] In Auckland are the pockets cut in the same way as that?—No; I believe the pockets are cut for the girls.

23. *The Chairman.*] Is there a saving of time? How long would it take a girl to cut the pockets?—Well, I suppose a minute.

24. For a whole garment?—Yes.

25. *Mr. Laurensen.*] Do you cut the pockets with a knife or scissors?—Scissors. [Witness concluded his evidence by a short explanation of a technical nature regarding the cutting of garments.]

TUESDAY, 17TH JULY, 1900.

Messrs. T. BALLINGER, C. D. MORPETH, and T. WARDELL, representing the Wellington Employers' Association, in attendance and examined.

THOMAS BALLINGER examined. (No. 10.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your name, please?—Thomas Ballinger.

2. You represent the Wellington Employers' Association?—Yes; I am vice-president of the association. Our president is in England at the present time.

3. You desire to give evidence in connection with this Bill—Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration?—Yes.

4. I may say, Mr. Ballinger, we have laid down the following line in the taking of evidence—*i.e.*, you will please confine your evidence to the new matter contained in this Bill, dealing only with the clauses to which you object, and making any suggestions you have in regard to them. The clauses which you do not mention we will take it you do not object to. Will you please proceed?—I should like to say first of all, sir, that all the new matter contained in this Bill is supposed to be marked by black lines, but we find to a certain extent that this is not correct. There is not only new matter in the Bill, but in several places old matter has been left out, and no notes made in the margin to draw attention to this fact. On page 2, clause 3, which says, "Employer" includes persons, firms, companies, and corporations," we desire the words "employing workers" inserted, "employing workmen" having been left out.

5. Your suggestion, then, is that these words be inserted?—Yes; as they were in the old Act. The words "employing workers" have been left out of the present Bill, and there is no note in the margin to show the alteration. Personally, I have very strong reasons for this. We were before the Conciliation Board two years ago, and members of certain firms had not been summoned. This was notable in the case of the Harbour Board and the City Council, both of whom employed plumbers. Now, I desired that these and several builders and others who were employing journey-men plumbers should be summoned before the Board, but the Board decided, at the suggestion of the union, that the journeymen should be summoned on the ground that they held a master plumber's license. The object of their taking out the master's license was that their employers were not plumbers. Some of these journeymen were actually members of the journeymen's union, and six of them signed the award. I may say that at that time I had not studied the Act, or I should have raised strong opposition. There is no reference to show that there has been anything deleted from the old Act. On page 3, clause 2 (d): "The claim of members of industrial unions of workers to be employed in preference to non-members." I have one or two suggestions to make in regard to wages. I think wages should be on a sliding scale. It is not right to say that the men should all have the same wage. Some men must get more wages than others as a matter of course.

6. *Mr. Hutcheson.*] Where does this question come in?—In the same clause. In regard to this question of preference, we strongly protest against this clause on the ground that the bulk of the workers are not unionists. The evidence given before the Conciliation Board one day last week—I think it was Thursday—showed this: One member—Mr. H. Warner—representing the Amalgamated Carpenters and Joiners' Union, stated there were nine hundred carpenters in Wellington, and Mr. Bollard said there were five hundred. The secretary of that union (Mr. F. W. A. Scott) said there were only about a hundred members in the union. I propose, Mr. Chairman, that in regard to the clauses to which we take exception, and the amendments we propose should be made, Mr. Morpeth should read them, and we should deal with them seriatim.

7. *The Chairman.*] Have you a copy of the suggested amendments typewritten?—Yes.

8. It will be better to hand them in afterwards, and I propose you should do so?—Very well.

*Mr. Morpeth:* The first matter I have to deal with is the preference clause—clause 2 (d), page 3. In the event of preference being granted to members of unions, we think a *quid pro quo* should be given by the unionist in return for the great advantage that the Act proposes to give them. One suggestion we have to make is, that members of the union should not be permitted to refuse work when it is offered to them, otherwise the union should be responsible. We would also suggest that the union should be responsible to the employers for the good behaviour of its individual members for damage through gross carelessness, wilful destruction of