

15. Your argument is that the Board may call in experts, but afterwards they do not form part of the Court?—Yes, so long as they do not form part of the Court. In subsection (3) of clause 98, "The Assessors shall be nominated," &c., I suggest "as the Court directs" be put in. Clause 113: We think, as an industrial association, that this should apply to all the Government employes, notwithstanding that they have got Boards. The essential spirit of the Act is to improve the condition of the workers.

16. *Mr. Laurensen.*] You could not include Police and Defence Departments in that, could you?—It should apply to the Public Works Department, and the Railways, and so on. That is all I have to say, Sir.

17. *Mr. Arnold.*] You personally represent the employers, do you not, Mr. Brown?—I do not claim to represent all the employers. You must not mix me up with the employers' associations. I represent the industrial associations.

18. In any case you represent those that are likely to come under this Act?—Yes, Sir.

19. You say that members and officers of a union should be skilled tradesmen?—Yes.

20. I want to point this out to you: In some cases secretaries of unions are continually discharged by their employers as soon as they take office: is that not so?—Well, I can only say that it is news to me.

21. A secretary, I say, can be discharged for very many reasons; he can be told there is no work; his successor can be discharged in three or four weeks, and when four or five of these secretaries are discharged in this way it is impossible to get another man in the union to take that office. In Wellington to-day there is one man who is secretary of about six unions. There is a movement in Christchurch to support one man wholly, so that he can be secretary of as many unions as possible. Might there not be a difficulty in this way between employers and men as regards all officers and members being *bona fide* tradesmen?—There might be; but we have been trying to make them good friends.

22. Do not you think that the same thing applies with regard to the small meetings that you spoke of? If it is decided that a certain case shall be referred to the Board, members may be in thorough sympathy with the dispute, but employers get to know who they are and how they vote?—My experience has been the reverse of yours. Generally I have found they are able to keep their counsel very well.

23. *Mr. Lewis.*] Would not the difficulty be got over by my suggestion, that the vote should be taken by ballot?—Yes, it would.

24. *Mr. Tanner.*] A majority of three-fourths would not help the numerical attendance of the meetings at all, would it?—No, I do not say that; my suggestion is this: some might attend, and those who do not choose to attend could write back "Yes," or "No."

25. To be quite sure that the dispute is approved of by the mass of the men in the trade?—Yes.

26. *The Chairman.*] You have had a considerable amount of experience on the Arbitration Court, and I should like to ask your opinion on this word "worker": do you think it would cover all classes—that all classes of workers would be brought under this Act?—Yes, all classes. I have not the slightest hesitation in saying it, and strongly affirm it. I make statements on broad grounds that if the Act is good for one it should be good for all. Personally I think this is a good step, and I might say that this is our association's view also.

J. HENRY MACKIE, in attendance and examined. (No. 13.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your name?—J. Henry Mackie; I represent the Auckland Provincial Industrial Association.

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

3. Will you please confine your evidence to any new matter contained in the Bill?—I may say, Sir, first of all, leading up to this question of "references to Board or Court to be approved by resolution of union," I should like to offer a suggestion in order that it may be ascertained approximately what are the views of the majority of members belonging to the union. I suggest that the number entitled to vote should be in some proportion to the number on the roll of the union. I think that would be the most effective means of dealing with what is now a very objectionable state of affairs. In certain unions representing trades that are in fairly satisfactory positions, it is left open to the minority of members of a union to bring a firm of employers before the Board or Court and cite them in dispute. The strong objection is this: that it brings persons before the Board or Court who have no dispute between themselves and their employes, and there is a good deal of evidence taken there that should not be made public. I suggest that some reasonable proportion should be determined on. I am not prepared to say what that proportion should be; it should, however, be decided, in order that manufacturers generally may properly ascertain the strength and feeling of parties in regard to any of the matters to go before the Court. We have already had difficulty in dealing with this question. Some manufacturers in a town, and representing large industries, have stood aloof from joining the Industrial Association because they fear it is simply an employers' association in another guise. Attention has been drawn to the fact that the expression in the new Bill, "Industrial Associations," is identical with the title of our institution, and I am pleased to observe that the Committee approve of the alteration of the term in the Bill. I wish to make that point clear in dealing with this matter. No doubt the functions of an industrial association are properly understood by the Committee. I should like to put it in evidence that we make a distinction between employers' associations and industrial associations. In regard to clauses 85 and 86, they are somewhat identical, and they might be consolidated, if I may take the liberty of suggesting it. With reference to subsection (3) of clause 85, and subsection (3) of clause 86, it seems to me that they go on similar lines to a certain extent. Unfortunately, there is a difference of opinion between the southern associa-