

always fair. I admit it does good work. To admit it was fair would be to admit it was always fair.

168. You told me the Court was just?—I think it tries to be just.

169. Do you know any case of your own knowledge that has been brought before the Court in which it has acted unjustly?—Yes, I do.

170. Was it because the evidence had not been placed before it, or what was the reason?—It may have been that. I only remember one or two cases where it has been grievously, to my mind, at fault, and I think that was because the Court had taken up a standard on the matter, instead of listening to the evidence and being guided thereby.

171. Do you think that you are able to get at the true state of a trade, probably in Canterbury, better than the Court could which would be sitting there and calling evidence on both sides?—No, I do not.

172. And yet you want us to lay down a hard-and-fast rule dealing with matters that you do not understand, and that you admit the Court would be able to deal with?—As a matter of principle, I think that in certain cases that should be done. I take it that Parliament is even a higher Court, and if it considers that certain things should be done I consider Parliament should rule. I think the Court of Parliament is a great deal higher than what a Judge is.

173. Do you think Parliament knows as much about these matters as Parliament's experts who are set up to deal with them?—It would not be necessary for them to do that. For instance, Parliament limits the hours that children shall work, and limits the age at which they shall be employed in a factory. There they must be a certain age. If allowed to go on indiscriminately, the Judge of the Court would not make any complaint about that. He would deal out justice, but the Parliament says, on principle, until a certain age you shall not employ.

174. Take the freezing companies in Canterbury. You say you do not approve of overtime: how are these freezing companies going to deal with products that come into them very quickly in certain portions of the year, and, in fact, in any other parts of the year?—I can see the difficulty. The employes of the freezing companies have pointed out on different occasions the difficulty.

175. Then you think there should be an exception made in regard to freezing companies?—If the employes think so.

176. Not the employes only, but the employes and the employer together: both have an interest, have they not?—I referred you to, say, the trade.

177. Take the other industry, the dairying industry: do you not think a little exception might be made for them?—I have not sufficient knowledge of the dairying industry, except what I have gained through the papers, and that is not always relied upon to give an opinion. I notice at a conference at Palmerston the other day one of the speakers said that the overtime in the dairying industry should be limited considerably, and that it was made unfair use of. The hours they were working were ridiculous.

178. You do not know anything about this personally?—No, not personally.

179. *Mr. Laurensen.*] I suppose, Mr. Naughton, your inquiries hitherto have been mainly connected with factories connected with trades?—Yes.

180. Really, after all, in voicing your own opinion on, say, the large factories in Canterbury, the persons objecting are those in the town factories, where the work is more of a casual nature?—That is so.

181. In reference to that question of overtime, and also the trades that Mr. Hardy has drawn attention to, such as freezing companies, dairies, and tanneries, it would be a serious matter if this Act was put into force and made to apply to them. You do not venture an opinion, do you?—Speaking generally of factories which exist in the town, and where we are all cognisant of what goes on, I should think I am well able to give an opinion. Of course, we know nothing of the dairying industry, that Mr. Hardy has been questioning me upon.

182. Nor yet about the freezing companies?—Yes; there are freezing companies in close proximity to this town.

183. Are you aware that the freezing companies in close proximity to Wellington have represented to us that it would be a mistake to put this Act into force in connection with their establishments?—I am not aware of that this session. In previous sessions both employes and employers have represented that it would be a grievous harm to them. It seems to be a matter of arrangement; but under the existing conditions it seems, undoubtedly, it would be so.

184. You represent the Wellington unions: are you aware that the Christchurch unions want subsections (a), (b), and (c) in clause 19 made only to apply to young persons and females?—No.

185. Then, in reference to that clause where payment is made for a half-holiday that Mr. Hutcheson drew your attention to: you say, to a very large extent, you are in favour of that?—Yes.

186. We want to hear evidence in favour of this clause, just as well as evidence against it. We want to hear any argument you have to put for or against it. It compels a man to pay for twenty-six full days in the year, *plus* six days' holidays, which makes thirty-two days he would have to pay his men, equalling £16 for no equivalent. Are you aware that a man who was up here before the Committee the other day represented one of the largest Christchurch unions there is and said that that union strongly objected to any such clause being inserted in this Bill?—No; but I am aware there is a considerable amount of difference of opinion in regard to whether the employer, in addition to giving the half-holiday a week, should be asked to pay for the holidays mentioned in the Bill. Some of our men maintain that if we ask for a holiday and do no work for that day, we should not be paid. I think there is another way of looking at it. It is necessary for a man to have so-much to live on, and the industry he is working in should be able to allow a margin to pay for these holidays in a year.

187. There are some industries which are brought into competition with our Home competitors,