

1910.  
NEW ZEALAND

---

## RAILWAYS COMMITTEE

(REPORT OF) ON THE PETITIONS OF W McARLEY AND OTHERS, AND FIFTY-EIGHT SIMILAR PETITIONS (ENGINE-DRIVERS, FIREMEN AND CLEANERS' ASSOCIATION) TOGETHER WITH MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

(MR. HOGAN, CHAIRMAN.)

*Reports brought on 3rd and 10th November and ordered to be printed.*

---

### ORDERS OF REFERENCE.

---

*Extracts from the Journals of the House of Representatives.*

THURSDAY, THE 7TH DAY OF JULY, 1910.

*Ordered*, "That a Committee be appointed, consisting of ten members, to examine and report upon questions relating to the railways; with power to call for persons and papers; three to form a quorum: the Committee to consist of Mr. Arnold, Mr. Brown, Mr. Buick, Mr. Craigie, Mr. Hine, Mr. Hogan, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Ross, Mr. Wity, and the mover."—(Hon. Mr. MILLAR.)

FRIDAY, THE 9TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 1910.

*Ordered*, "That the petition of J Abern and others be referred direct to the Railways Committee."—(Hon. R. MCKENZIE.)

THURSDAY, THE 3RD DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1910.

*Ordered*, "That the report of the Railways Committee on the petitions of W McArley and others, and fifty-eight similar petitions, be referred back to that Committee for further consideration, the Committee to report thereon within seven days."—(Mr. WRIGHT.)

## REPORT.

REPORT on the PETITION of W McARLEY and Others (also Fifty-eight similar Petitions, containing 1,068 Signatures of the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association), praying that Official Recognition be granted to them as a Separate Organization from those of other Branches of the Railway Service.

I AM directed to report,—

Clause (1). That in the opinion of this Committee the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants has represented the engine-drivers, firemen and cleaners equally as well as the other sections of the Railway Service.

Clause (2). That due prominence has always been given to the requirements of the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners when the Railway Department has been approached by the delegates of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants.

Clause (3). That, notwithstanding this, and after hearing the evidence from both sides, and carefully considering it, the Committee is of opinion that there is no possibility of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants and the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association coming to an agreement, and that, as it is in the best interests of the Railway Service that these two sections should work in harmony this Committee recommends the petition of the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association to the Government for favourable consideration.

J. T. HOGAN,  
Chairman

3rd November, 1910.

### SCHEDULE OF 58 PETITIONS, SIMILAR TO No. 8. (W McARLEY AND 14 OTHERS.)

<p>No. 22.—F Calnan and 20 others.            „ 23.—C. H. Webb and 19 others.            „ 24.—P Thomas and 2 others.            „ 36.—G. J. Brice and 28 others.            „ 37.—H. Brown and 19 others.            „ 38.—R. H. Clark and 42 others.            „ 39.—R. Huston and 4 others.            „ 40.—W H. Kelly and 6 others.            „ 41.—E. Slowey and 19 others.            „ 42.—C. L. Smith and 19 others.            „ 43.—H. N. Stokes and 8 others.            „ 44.—J. T. Tangaroa and 19 others.            „ 50.—P. D. Clark and 16 others.            „ 51.—A. S. Clinch and 13 others.            „ 52.—E. W. Henderson and 44 others.            „ 53.—Charles Little and 5 others.            „ 54.—R. McKee and 19 others.            „ 55.—J. Reardon and 15 others.            „ 56.—F. Roberts and 6 others.            „ 57.—John Stevens and 19 others.            „ 58.—A. P. Williams and 14 others.            „ 59.—B. Boden and 9 others.            „ 60.—T. J. Henry and 11 others.            „ 61.—R. Irving and 19 others.            „ 62.—A. V. Johnston and 5 others.            „ 63.—C. A. Mayes and 6 others.            „ 64.—T. Milroy and 20 others.            „ 65.—J. C. Murdin and 27 others.            „ 66.—Arthur Payne and 5 others.</p>	<p>No. 67.—J. P. Weale and 23 others.            „ 81.—H. Archibald and 13 others.            „ 82.—J. T. Barclay and 16 others.            „ 83.—H. Boyle and 12 others.            „ 84.—R. Findlay and 19 others.            „ 85.—Wm. Greig and 8 others.            „ 86.—G. E. Lee and 47 others.            „ 87.—E. M. Leydon and 13 others.            „ 88.—T. D. Luxton and 18 others.            „ 89.—G. F. Martin and 19 others.            „ 90.—C. Southey and 17 others.            „ 91.—H. J. Thompson and 5 others.            „ 99.—A. J. Hodge and 19 others.            „ 100.—B. H. Jane and 7 others.            „ 110.—A. Littlejohn and 19 others.            „ 111.—J. H. Craven and 22 others.            „ 112.—J. M. Drennan and 19 others.            „ 113.—G. A. Haddrell and 14 others.            „ 114.—W. J. McGonigal and 19 others.            „ 115.—F. H. Murphy and 19 others.            „ 116.—A. Purcell and 19 others.            „ 117.—A. J. Watling and 19 others.            „ 125.—W. J. Fraser and 39 others.            „ 126.—N. E. Harris and 5 others.            „ 127.—D. McMurchie and 13 others.            „ 128.—G. Munro and 9 others.            „ 129.—W. T. Scott and 19 others.            „ 130.—H. C. Bishop and 19 others.            „ 425.—J. Ahern and 25 others.</p>
---	---

## SECOND REPORT

I AM directed to report,—

The Committee having reconsidered the report on the petitions of the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association and the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, referred back to them by the House, have the honour to report that, while confirming same, they submit the following *addenda* thereto

The Committee are of opinion that the Amalgamated Society's present powers should be in no way curtailed, and the Society should be permitted to retain full power of representing such of the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners as may be or remain members of the Society, and of representing to the Minister their grievances and complaints.

J. T. HOGAN,  
Chairman.

10th November, 1910.

## MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

FRIDAY, 9TH SEPTEMBER, 1910

(No. 1.)

*Mr G W Russell, M.P* Mr Chairman and gentlemen,—I have been requested by the executive of the Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association to act on their behalf, and I have to thank the Committee for placing first the petition with my name on the top for the purpose of giving me an opportunity of opening the case. I do not propose to make a lengthy address on this occasion, because the matter was very fully gone into last year, and consequently it is not necessary that I should deal with the matter at length. There are, however, one or two points that I would like to emphasize, and they are as follows: The petitions that have been sent in to the House this year have a total number of signatures of men belonging to the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association of, I think, 1,089. That is the actual number of men belonging to this society who have asked Parliament to amend the law so as to give them recognition. As I understand, the total possible membership of the society is somewhere about 1,400: it will thus be seen that an enormous majority of the members have asked for this recognition. Now the position is that, extending over a number of years, there has been dissatisfaction on the part of the locomotive-men with the treatment that they received from the Amalgamated Society. I am not going to attempt to trace the causes of that, but I will say that the men considered that, on account of the magnitude, the diversity, and the lack of cohesion represented by the Amalgamated Society, there was little or no chance of their interests being fully considered, and proof of that was given last year before this Committee by the delegates from the engine-drivers' society, who pointed out that, while other branches of the service had received material increases in their wages and salaries, their department of the service had had virtually no advantage, notwithstanding the fact that the cost of living had enormously increased during recent years, and the reason for this was stated as arising out of the fact that in a large service like the Railways an enormous proportion of the men are necessarily receiving lower rates of wages than the engine-drivers. It is natural that a society which includes an enormous number of service-men such as shunters, porters, and other classes who receive small salaries would be compelled almost of necessity to look after the interests of the men who are receiving low rates of wages rather than to make the primary cause of their operations an increase in the wages of the locomotive-men, who, on account of the technical nature of their work and on account of the high qualifications they have to possess, necessarily receive a larger rate of pay than the other branches. This feeling grew until at last the men in New Zealand realized that if they were to get their grievances redressed, and, above all, if they were to get them clearly and distinctly brought before the management and the Minister, there was only one thing to do, and that was to establish a union of their own, as is done in almost every country in the world. It is not necessary for me to produce proof, but I can say that Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Associations exist and are officially recognized in England, Scotland, Ireland, America, Argentina, Sweden, Africa, France, Germany, Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, and Tasmania. I am here this morning to assert, on behalf of the union which I represent, that similar unions exist in those countries, and are working side by side with the other societies similar to that which in New Zealand is called the Amalgamated Society. That therefore negatives any such idea as that there must of necessity be hostility between the two associations if the second one were recognized. Now, sir, I shall call evidence during the inquiry to show that, in the opinion of men who are best qualified to judge—that is, the men themselves—the Amalgamated Society has not in the past satisfactorily and efficiently represented the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners to their satisfaction. I shall call evidence to prove that due prominence has not been given to the requests of the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners as a body. I shall call evidence that will prove that this is a legally constituted union recognized by the law, and that the only difficulty that stands in the way of the official recognition by the Department is the fact that there is a law upon our statute-book which is not in operation. Under clause 121 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act it is provided that the Minister may make an industrial agreement with the Amalgamated Society and the fact that the Amalgamated Society is mentioned there is the sole bar to the official recognition by the Department of the Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Union. You have heard the report read from the General Manager this morning, in which he states to this Committee that the Department sees no objection to the official recognition of the Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Union. I shall prove, by asking the General Manager, that there is no industrial agreement between the Amalgamated Society and the Government; I shall prove that there never has been an application on either side for an industrial agreement, and that therefore this law which stands in the way of official recognition of the Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Union is nothing but a shadow—nothing but a figment—a thing that is being used now against its original intention, and being used for the purpose of obstructing the aspirations of a number of men who seek for their own protection and benefit to improve their position. Now, referring to the objects of the Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Union, they naturally place in the forefront of their objects to act for the mutual assistance and protection of the members. The second clause of their objects, as stated in the sheet I have before me, and which I propose to hand in, is to prevent strikes in the Railway service. This is an association having a no-strike clause in its conditions, and I

wish to emphasize that before this Committee to-day The Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association have in their constitution a clause which provides that there shall be no strike. The Amalgamated Society possesses no such clause apart from the law which is in the Arbitration and Conciliation Act penalizing those persons who should go out on strike in connection with the railways. If we had such a thing as is proposed by certain people in New Zealand—namely, a federation of labour—and I would point out to the Committee that that is being strongly urged at the present time—a union welding the whole of the labour classes into one—if such a union declared that labour shall strike, you might have your railways stopped except that the locomotive-men, who are the heart and soul of the Railway service, would, according to their constitution, refuse to participate in anything that would stop the traffic in this country. Which of the societies is worthy of recognition, the one that has as the foundation of its constitution “No strike” or the society that holds itself free to strike if occasion arose? It is not proper to suggest that the Minister should give evidence before an inquiry of this kind, but the Hon. the Minister not long ago visited Australia, and while there he came in contact with large bodies of men representing the Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Unions there. He saw the Managers, the Commissioners of Railways in all the different States, and he thus had an opportunity—he being himself a labour-man, and having risen from the ranks—of hearing the views of both classes. On the one hand he heard the views of the locomotive-men, and on the other hand, as Minister of Railways, he had the opportunity of discussing the question from the point of view of the control and management with the Commissioners. I understand that since the Hon. Mr. Millar returned he has stated that he is prepared to recommend Cabinet that official recognition should be granted to the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association. That being the case, I think that my work this morning is of a very subsidiary character. I have only now to deal with one point, and that is with regard to the report of the Committee last year, that by the internal re-organization of the society the petitioners could always get direct representation on the executive of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. Now, sir, I am quite prepared to admit that some of the members of the Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Union were upon the executive of the Amalgamated Society. We have two or three gentlemen here this morning who belong to the Amalgamated Society, and who have occupied high positions in connection with the society, and who are themselves engine-drivers, but I say, so far as those gentlemen are concerned, they represent a very small minority of the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners. Another thing I wish to say is that the efforts that have been made during the year by the Amalgamated Society have not led to success. They had in their minds a scheme for getting direct representation of a particular class of the service upon the executive of that body, but, unfortunately, the time has gone past, in my opinion, when such a proposal is practicable. The feeling of the locomotive-drivers now is that nothing is open to them but to have their own society recognized, and then federate with the Amalgamated Society if such is thought desirable and agreed to. Now, it has been said time after time that if recognition were given to the locomotive-engine drivers, firemen, and cleaners, the probability is that other sections of the service would break off. Well, the position is this—that the officers have their own union already, and they are making it a very active union at the present time. Whether the guards and other men of that class would be likely to break off is a matter that I am not competent to express an opinion upon, but my own opinion is that they would not. The fact is that the locomotive-men represent so clearly a distinct branch of the service that it seems to me to be quite natural that that branch should have a union of their own to be able to represent the technicalities of their service. Take a case like the Government Printing Office. That is as much a State service as the railways, and it would be simply absurd if an attempt was made to squeeze the bookbinders, stereotypers, linotypists, machinists, and all the other branches of the Government Printing Office into one union. Such an idea would be absurd, and if a proposal was made to that effect it would result in the splitting-up of that union into several sections and then federating for the purpose of one common good. What I ask the Committee to do is to recommend to Parliament that there should be power to allow the locomotive-men to register side by side with the Amalgamated Society, and then when any questions arose for the common good those two associations could stand together to represent matters to the Minister from the proper point of view, leaving each separate branch of the society to deal with those matters with which it was most cognizant and which referred to its particular branch of the service. I can only say that, for myself, I am a printer. If I am dealing with my staff, or any other staff, and a man comes to me representing the linotype machinists, I know exactly what I am dealing with, and it would be absurd to expect the bookbinders to come to me in connection with the linotype operators or machinists. I would like to say that we live in an age when industrial unionism is recognized. These men have formed their union. They cannot register under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, but they have registered under the one Act that is available—that is, the Trades-union Act. They have a strong society with branches everywhere. I do not know that it is necessary for me to say any more, but I would like, with the permission of the Committee, to ask Mr. Ronayne two or three questions.

THOMAS RONAYNE examined. (No. 2.)

- 1 *Mr Russell.*] You are General Manager of the New Zealand Railways?—Yes.
2. Speaking as General Manager has there ever been any industrial agreement made between the Government and the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants?—No registered agreement. The agreement is simply by memorandum.
3. Is that the memorandum that was signed and upon which a ballot was taken by the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants at the time when the Amalgamated Society was received back by the Government after the strike?—Yes.

4. And is there any agreement between the Amalgamated Society and the Government Department that there should be no strike?—No.

5. Now, you have said as General Manager in your report to the Committee, that, so far as the Department is concerned, there would be no objection to the association being recognized. May the Committee infer from that that it is your opinion that if this society of locomotive-engine drivers was recognized by the Government it would not be detrimental to the service?—I think you should put it more clearly. My report says, "subject to the decision of Parliament." The only objection that the management would have is this: There is a disability arising now with regard to the A.S.R.S. as to the interviews and the number of meetings they have. I think about nine members meet quarterly, and their meetings usually extend over a week, and sometimes a fortnight. They then interview myself and sometimes the Minister, and that takes the men from their duties, and it is very inconvenient to the Department. Then, again, they have a biennial Conference at which a larger number of men attend, and that runs into a fortnight or three weeks. That is in a sense inconvenient to the Department, but we have no objection to their meeting biennially. The only trouble is the time the men are away from their duties, and their positions have to be filled by acting-men, who have to be paid. If we are to have quarterly meetings and interviews with the executive, and also the biennial meeting, the time that the men will be taken from their duties will perhaps exceed that at the present time. My idea would be that the executive should work on something like the old lines—that is, when the executive were in Wellington they could conduct all cases by correspondence between the secretary, and then they could interview the management.

6. In your report to the Committee you stated that there would be no objection to the recognition on conditions. Would you mind saying if you have thought out what the conditions would be?—No, I think it is premature to do that. If Parliament decided that the engine-drivers' association must be recognized, then I will prepare conditions, but I have quite enough to do without looking so far ahead.

(No. 3.)

*Mr A. S. Malcolm, M.P.* : Mr Chairman and gentlemen,—I am appearing before the Committee simply because a number of my constituents have placed a number of petitions in my hands for presentation. Some years ago they asked me to represent their case, explained the matter, and I thought made out a very good case for recognition of their union. As a consequence I supported their claims in the House. Last year, in consequence of an amendment I moved, the Minister of Railways promised that he would do his best to secure an arrangement between the two parties, and on the strength of that I withdrew my amendment. Then, following that, the executive of the Amalgamated Society, as I thought, did its very best to secure an arrangement between the two sections by offering to resign in a body, and to allow the locomotive-men to directly appoint two members to the executive, and, that having been done, it seemed to me to prove that the Amalgamated Society was anxious to do all it could to secure uniformity on the lines of representation by the Amalgamated Society. I reported that fact to my constituents who are interested, and expressed the hope that, this generous action having been taken, they would see their way to fall in with it, and that the agitation for a separate union would cease. However, I have now to express their opinion on the matter, and they have advised me that they cannot consider the Amalgamated Society's proposals satisfactory, and that the matter has gone so far now that, over a thousand men being in their union, they could not see their way, even if official recognition were refused, to withdraw from their union. They have advised me, but, of course, I am not in a position to say whether correctly or incorrectly, that in the event of official recognition being refused the locomotive-men who have left would not again return to the Amalgamated Society. I asked them why in the circumstances they should be so very keen in demanding separate recognition, and I pointed out to them the danger of weakening the power of their union by division, but in reply they said that the Amalgamated Society has now reached such a strength as to be actually unwieldy; that the society is so large in numbers that its very strength tends now to defeat the object for which the union was formed—that is, representation and redress of grievances. I asked them then did they claim that the Amalgamated Society would not represent their grievances—did they urge that the Amalgamated Society would deliberately obstruct the redress of their grievances, and they said No, but owing to the overwhelming amount of business that came before the Amalgamated Society it was not so much the representation of grievances as the emphasis that was laid on the grievances, and they said that their most important grievances were simply part and parcel of a huge number of grievances that were brought before the Minister and their grievances were obscured. That is one thing that makes them so anxious to have their own union recognized. When I informed them that they would have direct representation if they all fell in with the Amalgamated Society, they said they were still under this disability: that they would have two members out of an executive of eight, and that though generally the executive would be agreeable to such representations as they wished to make, still in a serious case they would have to carry the other six members with them. In other words, they desired to be allowed without let or hindrance to represent their own case to the Minister. Then, in regard to the point I impressed upon them of division weakening the union, they said that their own union was now such a strong one as to be able to stand on its feet. They said that a union that could claim a membership of a thousand was undoubtedly strong enough to stand on its own, but that they were willing to federate with the Amalgamated Society and that they would be delighted to work as a separate union for the common benefit of the whole service. You will not be interested in knowing my own opinion upon the matter, and I have simply come here this morning at the request of my constituents to represent their views upon the matter in regard to the petition which they have presented through me. However, I should just like to say that I have carried out the pro-

mise that I made in the House that I would do the best I could to secure agreement. The Amalgamated Society have gone as far as they could to induce the locomotive-men to fall in with them, but, as I say, the latter have declined to do so.

SAMUEL KENNEDY examined. (No. 4.)

1 *The Chairman.*] What are you?—An engine-driver

2 Will you make a statement giving your reasons why you urge that your association should receive recognition?—Yes. I am vice-president of the Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association. I will endeavour to be as brief as possible, and I do not think I will take anything like half an hour, which is the time you have stipulated for my address, but I should like to state that in replying I may require a little more than ten minutes, because there may be new ground broken that I am not aware of, and which I may desire to reply to. It is hardly necessary for me to go into the whole of the history of this association. The association was formed two years and three months ago, and for a number of years previous to that the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners of New Zealand have been very much dissatisfied with the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, or with the way they were having their business done by that society, and there was continual faultfinding. We remained in that society and supported it, taking a very keen interest in it, but there was a large number who were very much dissatisfied, and there was a continual suggestion that we should have a society of our own. That society has been formed now for two years, and has been registered as a union in accordance with the laws of this country. Now, when our petition was brought before this Committee twelve months ago, an argument that was used against the recognition of this union by the president of the Amalgamated Society is contained in a letter which he read to you, and which is also contained in the report of the Committee last year. The letter was written on the 26th July, 1909, to the Minister of Railways, and I should like to quote two of the sentences which were used as an argument against us. He says, "It seems to me perfectly fair to ask that they be required to maintain a membership for one year of 1,000 members." He was trying to prevent our union being recognized, and urging on the Minister that there was no desperate hurry, and he suggested that it was a fair thing to ask them to maintain 1,000 members for one year. That test would prove whether the membership had been gained by a spasm of popular feeling or a general desire to form a separate union." Now, gentlemen, twelve months have elapsed. As you are aware, we did not receive recognition when we first petitioned for it. We have come to you again, and we have passed the test imposed upon us by the president of the Amalgamated Society. We have not only the 1,000 members, but we have a petition before you signed by over 1,000 members asking for recognition, and we have on our books now over 1,100 members, so that we have 100 more than the membership which Mr Veitch required us to keep up. I can assure you, gentlemen, it has been a very hard job to keep that membership up, because you can understand that members of our union, knowing that it was not recognized, and knowing it was problematical whether we should be recognized in the future, and knowing that the Amalgamated Society was recognized and could deal with their grievances, it was enough to damp the ardour of our men, and make them throw up our union, and say, "I am going back to the one that is already recognized." However, notwithstanding that fact, our union has maintained itself, and has been growing during the last twelve months. We have passed the test that was imposed by the Amalgamated Society, and which Mr Veitch appeared to consider a reasonable one, and we have come again before you with our request, and we think for that reason it should be granted. It was said in the House last week that the locomotive-men were not unanimous in their desire for this union, but that is hardly reasonable. Certainly it would be hard to find 1,400 men who were unanimous on any one subject, but out of a maximum of 1,400 men you have over 1,000 petitioning you on the one subject, and I think from that you will see that we have, if not a unanimous request, certainly a very large majority. Last year you will remember we only had 700 or a little more signing our petitions, but this year we have increased the number, and those members are unanimous and earnest in their request that this union should be recognized. To show you that we are unanimous, twelve months ago the Amalgamated Society sent a petition round amongst the locomotive-men praying that our grievances be sent through the Amalgamated Society instead of through the Engine-drivers and Firemen's Association, and to that petition they only got signatures numbering a little over 250 out of 1,400 men. I think that proves that the locomotive-men want this union, and do not want any other society. Further than that, we have eighteen branches of this association established throughout New Zealand, and each one of them has carried a resolution supporting the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association, and declaring their allegiance to it, while at the same time declaring that they have no confidence in the Amalgamated Society. The accusation has been made, and it is a frequent argument used against us, that our association has been established to break up the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. I am sorry that the charge has been made against us, because it is certainly not correct. Nothing has been further from our desires. We do not wish to hinder the Amalgamated Society, and I am sure we should be very sorry indeed if we thought we were doing them any harm, or if we thought there was any chance of that society falling through. We do not wish to see that; we wish to see it flourish and maintain itself as the Amalgamated Society should. We have not requested the Minister of Railways to cease recognizing that society, and we do not wish to do so, and would not do so if it were possible. We wish the Minister to recognize it, but I ask, gentlemen, can we ascribe that generous feeling to the leaders of the Amalgamated Society? I think not. We claim that we have been a stimulus to the Amalgamated Society since we seceded from it. If you read the official paper of that society you will find that the membership has been steadily increasing during the last two years, and during that time the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners have been seceding from that society. Notwithstanding that fact, they have increased their branches and increased their membership, so that I do not think there is anything in their argument that

our desire to form a union of our own will tend to break up their society. We have also been accused of introducing sectionalism. Now, any one who understands what sectionalism is knows perfectly well that there is nothing sectional about our union. Our union includes and embraces one body of workers and only one—we embrace the whole of the staff working and controlling the locomotives of the New Zealand railways, we take in the whole of the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners in New Zealand. It is one union from Auckland to the Bluff, and I do not think it is fair to charge us with sectionalism when we take in the whole industry. I think, when this association is recognized, which we sincerely hope it will be, that it will continue to act as a stimulus to the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. We think that the friendly rivalry that would be engendered would be such as to keep the society alive. When they have a monopoly, and there is no other union, it has been proved in the past that they are liable to lull and go to sleep. There is nothing heard of them for a while, and after the years pass by they go to work again; but I think if another society was working in friendly rivalry it would be a stimulus to the Amalgamated Society and prove beneficial. We claim, therefore, that in establishing our association we have not injured the society in any way, and do not intend to do so. I might say there is yet work before the Amalgamated Society without opposing this union. There are now four or five thousand railway employees who are non-unionists. They do not belong to any union, and the Amalgamated Society has this body of men to work on, which would enable the society to increase its membership by almost double what it is now. We think it very hard that, after complying with the laws of this country, and having our society registered, we cannot get recognition. There are 1,100 drivers, firemen, and cleaners who are smarting under this injustice, and we think it is not fair. This country has legislated so that a body of twenty-five men belonging to one particular industry can become registered, and immediately they are registered their employer is bound to recognize them, and yet here is a body of 1,100 men engaged in the most important work of the Railway service, and the Minister of Railways will not recognize them as an association although they have been registered for two years. It is a strange thing, gentlemen, that when the clerical division left the Amalgamated Society there was absolutely no protest whatever, but when the drivers, firemen, and cleaners leave them, what do we find? Very bitter opposition to our association. Now, gentlemen, I do not want to impute ulterior motives to the Amalgamated Society, but I ask, on the face of it is it not suspicious, when one considers that the clerical division would be of very little use to them in the case of a strike, and the engine-drivers and firemen would be the keynote to the whole thing, that strike is their object. Well, gentlemen, I think you will see from the remarks I have made that we are entitled to recognition, and justly entitled to recognition according to the laws of this country. The statute provides for other men who form a union being recognized, and I think it is only reasonable that we should be. You will see, gentlemen, that we have passed the test and still have a solid union, and when you remember that our association is composed of a strong body of men, and that they have leaders who are competent to so look after the interests of the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners of New Zealand that they will receive the full benefit of the labour laws of this country, I think it is your duty to give the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association the opportunity of doing so. Now, there is just one other subject I wish to mention before I sit down, and that is with regard to the ill feeling that has existed. A few days ago in the House Mr. Ell said that all the feeling had practically subsided. Now, I am very pleased indeed to be able to indorse Mr. Ell's statement. I can assure you that I travel over a hundred miles of the railway in Canterbury, and I see the railwaymen from one end to the other, and frequently have conversations with them. Twelve months ago there was very bitter feeling between the guards and shunters and others, and they did not care whether they spoke to you or not. However, I am glad to say the feeling has almost subsided, and lately one of the guards said to me, "I don't see why you should not get your union—it would be a good thing," and I am prepared to state that at the end of twelve months there will be no ill feeling between the railwaymen whatever. The whole thing will have quieted down, they will see that it was a fair and reasonable thing we were asking for, and there will be no bickering or ill feeling whatsoever. There is one more remark I should like to make, and that is this. We are not going back. Gentlemen, I would not dare to entertain for one moment any idea of going back, and then go back amongst my fellow-workers in Canterbury, they would treat me as an outcast if I did so. They have all made up their minds that there is only one body of men who are attempting to oppose them. They realize that twelve months ago they would have been recognized by the Minister of Railways except for the one body in New Zealand, and that is the Amalgamated Society, and I can assure you that, while the Amalgamated Society oppose recognition to the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners of New Zealand, there is not the slightest chance of the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners going back and leaving their own union.

WILLIAM MCARLEY examined. (No. 5.)

1 *The Chairman.*] What are you?—An engine-driver

2 Will you make a statement to the Committee with reference to the recognition of your association by the Government?—Yes. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen,—I consider the two previous speakers have covered all the ground which is necessary to prove to you that the New Zealand Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Union should be officially recognized. There are just one or two points which I wish to impress upon the Committee here, and which have been overlooked by the other speakers. I desire to impress upon you, gentlemen, that we are not here to ask your leave to form a union, as we have already done so, and, furthermore, it has been in existence for fully two years. This union has come to stay and we are here to ask you to alter the law, and enable the Minister to officially recognize our union. I must also impress upon you that this union is a registered union: it is registered under the Trades-union Act, 1908, and comes

within the four corners of the law in respect to trades-unions. Therefore, under these circumstances, if the Government makes provision for our union to be registered, it must, to be consistent, make provision for it to be duly recognized by the Minister of Railways as a body representing the locomotive-engine drivers, firemen, and cleaners on the New Zealand railways. I must also impress upon you that the locomotive-men's union has within its ranks fully 1,110 locomotive-engine drivers, firemen, and cleaners on the New Zealand railways, and also that fully 1,100 of these men have signed a petition asking for their union to be officially recognized. Now, as a proof that the men are in earnest as to their purpose, I draw your attention to the fact that the petition to the last Parliament was signed by 722, and this petition before you now has, to the best of my belief, been signed by over three hundred more drivers, firemen, and cleaners. That alone, gentlemen, is ample justification for you to recommend this Parliament to extend official recognition to our union. There is and always has been a feeling among locomotive-men that their whole salvation rests in having a union composed of their own calling only. It is well known to you that almost every trade outside the Railway service is represented by a union composed wholly of men in that special trade or calling. This class of unionism is not overlapping unionism, but the representation of a trade by that trade itself. Then why, I ask, should that privilege be not extended to the railwaymen? Is there any logical reason why it should not be so? I most emphatically say there is no logical reason. Another point in reference to these locomotive unions is that they exist in every country in the world. There is not one country, to my knowledge, where they do not exist. Then why are we not allowed the same freedom? Are we not intelligent enough or capable enough of looking after our own affairs? Surely that is not the reason why we are not allowed official recognition? But what is the benefit to be derived from these unions? Why, in every country they are found to be very beneficial to locomotive-men. They not only bring about higher wages and better conditions, but they are great factors in the education and edification of these men. Taking America, for instance, their latest move is for these unions to establish a school of correspondence, a school where the men are taught the technicalities of their work. Every effort is made to bring their members up to the very highest standard of knowledge in locomotive-running and railway-work generally. Now, this is a very important item to the travelling public; it is sound logic, and, I may add, imperative reason why this union in New Zealand should be officially recognized by the Government. Where you have men who are anxious and desirous to improve their knowledge, is there any reason why you should put obstacles in their way? I certainly think not. One of the soundest reasons why you should extend recognition to us is that you are by doing so insuring greater safety to the travelling public. Another factor is that these unions are productive of a more brotherly feeling amongst the locomotive-men. By coming in contact with each other and discussing their service conditions generally it engenders a good feeling among the men. I now wish to read, or, rather, to quote you from the *Railway Gazette* in Australia as to what takes place there. The article is written by a member of these associations, and he says, "A better feeling exists to-day between the men, and a better feeling between the officers and the workers obtains to-day as the result of the existence of smaller bodies of men joining together and coming into direct communication with each other." Now, that is a candid statement from a gentleman who has had practical experience of these unions. This statement, I am sure, can be fully substantiated by our Minister of Railways, who recently visited Australia. Again, I wish to impress upon you that if recognition of these unions brings about this state of affairs, it must be apparent to you that the result must be more capable men and more efficient service, and, what is more important than all, it adds greater safety to the travelling public. Are you going to ignore all these important and logical reasons for the official recognition of our union? Now, it may seem very strange to you to see two locomotive-men appearing here to-day in objection to the recognition of our union, but you will find that almost everywhere in Australia there is a class of men who do not receive the confidence of their fellow-mates, so there can be no objection to recognition on that score, as almost in every country these men are to be found. I am positively certain that it will always be found that it is an utter impossibility to get all the locomotive-men of the one mind, irrespective of the fact that these men do not receive the fullest confidence of other locomotive-men. That is the reason why we have locomotive-men opposing us to-day, and if the Minister inquired while he was in Australia he would find that my statement is absolutely correct in every detail. Now, it has been stated by members of the House that the formation of, or, rather, the recognition of, this union will be the means of breaking up the Amalgamated Society, but you must disabuse your minds of that, because in several States in Australia there has existed for the last twenty years only the two unions, the Locomotive-men's Union and the Amalgamated Society. But, nevertheless, the fact must be borne in mind that where a large body of men are convinced that a union is not doing its duty towards them, then they should be allowed to work out their own salvation should they desire. As far as I am aware, no other body of railwaymen desires to withdraw from the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. Therefore the statement is merely a bogey to prejudice you against our case for official recognition. It is trotted out on every possible occasion, but is not and cannot be borne out by facts. I say this: that if this union receives official recognition it rests entirely with the Amalgamated Society to do its duty towards those remaining in its ranks. Let that society do its duty, and there is no reason why any body of men would desire to form a union. Why should any men desire to leave if they are being attended to by the Amalgamated Society satisfactorily to them? But I do say this: Where any body of men is dissatisfied, then you, as men representing democratic principles, have no right whatever to prevent these men from doing better for themselves if they are under the impression that they can do so. Now my point is this: that it is not for you to be the caretaker of any union, because if you do take up this position I without hesitation say that you are bringing a hornet's nest about your ears; you are simply encouraging that particular union to take things easy,



knowing that no other union can be formed to usurp their functions. This particular union would simply bask in the sunshine, but you will be continuously persecuted by its members, or, rather, by those who would get disgusted with that union's ineptitude. Therefore it must be positively clear to you that you have no right to be the guardian of any union, but that particular union should be its own guardian. Let the Amalgamated Society prove to its members that it is a very useful body, and they can rest assured that the members' common-sense will teach them whether it is more beneficial to remain in it or not. Certainly it is not your business. I am now going to touch briefly upon the scheme which has just recently been dangled before your eyes by the Amalgamated Society. The scheme I refer to is known as the departmental representation scheme. On behalf of the members of this union I absolutely refuse to touch this scheme. The scheme is in no way beneficial to the locomotive-men, and never would be. The members of this union emphatically decline to entertain the idea in any shape or form. It is simply useless to ask our members to accept it in any way, and there is not the slightest possible chance of our members agreeing to it. Our members are determined to gain recognition for their union, and resent to the fullest extent any tactics of the Amalgamated Society to coerce members of Parliament into blocking our recognition. Departmental representation has never proved a success in any country, and never will. But before I proceed further I must draw your attention to the fact that two of the locomotive-men opposing us to-day are also opposed to departmental representation. Then why is an endeavour being made to foist this scheme upon this union's members. It is simply preposterous. Does it not appear to you as being very hypocritical on these members' part to urge you to coerce us back into the Amalgamated Society through this scheme, which the leaders of the society, who are also locomotive-men, do not believe in themselves. I again state to you on behalf of the members of this union that they will not entertain this scheme for one moment. A large majority of our members have resigned from the Amalgamated Society, and it is absolutely useless to think that they are again going to join that body under any pretence whatever. All that has been said by the representatives of the Amalgamated Society in regard to resigning, &c., is simply bombast, and is all done for the purpose of delaying our recognition. That I am certain of. Now I want to refer to the statements being made that only a few of the locomotive-men have resigned from the Amalgamated Society. That is not a true statement—it is totally incorrect in so far as their own figures go. Now they state that only 700 locomotive-men have resigned. Very well. These are their own figures. When our petition was before Parliament last year it was stated on official figures that they had 1,163 locomotive-men on the books of the Amalgamated Society. Just so. Then, if 700 have resigned that leaves, on their own figures, only 463 locomotive-men in the ranks of the Amalgamated Society. But I am prepared to prove that fully 800 locomotive-men have resigned from that body. Therefore the total number of locomotive-men in the Amalgamated Society is somewhere about 363, and that I believe is a very close calculation. That leaves very few locomotive-men in the Amalgamated Society who are also members of this union, or else they are non-unionists. However, that aspect as affecting our recognition is only a side issue, as I know a considerable number of locomotive-men who are only waiting till this union is recognized and then they have expressed their willingness to join. In any case, the fact remains that fully 1,100 locomotive-men have signed a petition asking for the locomotive-men's union to be fully recognized officially. Therefore it does not follow that because a locomotive-man belongs to the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants he is not keenly desirous of having his own particular union officially recognized. What you have to look to in this respect is the fact that such a large majority of the locomotive-men are members of the New Zealand Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association, and fully two-thirds of the locomotive-men have signed the petitions. Those are the facts which you must look to in order to decide the issue. To be just and fair I maintain that where a large majority is in favour of a certain proposal it must in common fairness be granted. It is not fair to entertain the protests of those who are not directly interested, but who object on purely selfish principles. Those are the points which you must decide the issue on. Now, it is admitted that we have a large number of grievances which the Amalgamated Society say they have no power to rectify, and it is also a fact that our interests have been neglected. That has been proved beyond doubt, but it is simply absurd to go into all the details when certain facts are admitted and others have been proved. But, aside from these points, those who are most capable of judging whether our interests are being diligently attended to are the members of this union themselves. It must therefore be admitted that the members of this union have already decided that issue, and the very fact of their petitioning you for a change is, or should be, sufficient argument for you to recommend official recognition being granted to this union. Certainly you will agree with me that we, as a body of intelligent workers, are capable of being the best judges of the issue as to whether the Amalgamated Society has neglected our interests. Certainly I say the very fact of such a huge majority signing the petitions proves that they are thoroughly dissatisfied with the Amalgamated Society as a channel for locomotive-men's grievances. There is one item I wish to bring before you, although it is not a substantiative of any previous arguments, but it is to show you that we are quite prepared to bury the hatchet and go hand in hand with the Amalgamated Society. What I refer to is the proposal submitted to the Amalgamated Society by the locomotive-men's union. This union made a proposal to federate with the Amalgamated Society which was a very generous proposal indeed, but that scheme does not in any way submerge the identity of either the Amalgamated Society or the New Zealand locomotive-drivers' union. On the contrary, they both retain their entity and work amicably side by side within their own sphere. We consider that proposal a fair one, and will allow the whole Railway service, or, rather, I should say the whole of the members of the two unions, to speak with one voice on matters affecting the whole. Gentlemen, you must admit that in every way the proposal is a fair and sensible proposition. Further it is adopted by all outside unions of specific trades, and is found to answer its

purpose effectively. Another matter which I wish briefly to refer to is that one of the parties opposing our petitions is a financially interested party, and the larger the Amalgamated the larger will be his salary and perquisites. Therefore you must look upon that evidence as being biased, and not of any value. Another point is that he is not a railwayman. Mr Russell referred to the question of the no-strike provision in our constitution, but I wish to say that so far as the Amalgamated Society is concerned there is not a rule of any kind saying that there shall be no strike. There is one important point I should like to mention in regard to all the railwaymen being in the one society. There are times when locomotive-men have to report members of other sections for not carrying out their duties, and it is not right that we should be coerced into belonging to the Amalgamated Society, when this engenders an ill feeling and operates against us when we ask for anything that will benefit ourselves. In conclusion, I appeal to you to recommend the official recognition of the New Zealand Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association. I appeal to you for your indorsement of the well-founded principle of trades or crafts unions. It is a matter which must receive your approval if you have at heart the welfare of this young and, I may say, progressive country. With regard to federation, we have made a proposal to the society, and if we carried out that idea it would give us the right to make our own representations and still go hand in hand with the society when they wanted to make any representations to the management in regard to the Appeal Board or the Classification Board. Before concluding, sir, I wish to read to you a memorandum of reasons why the New Zealand Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association should be officially recognized. They are as follows: "1. The New Zealand Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association has been established since the 1st June, 1908, and embraces over 80 per cent. of the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners employed on the New Zealand Government Railways. 2. The N.Z.L.E.D.F. & C. Association is a registered union under the Trades-union Act, 1908, and duly recognized as a trades-union, under the laws enacted by New Zealand Parliaments. 3. The members of the N.Z.L.E.D.F. & C. Association occupy very responsible positions, being in charge of valuable machinery, and having under their care many human lives, and their work is of a highly technical nature. 4. The main objects of the N.Z.L.E.D.F. & C. Association are,—(1) to act for the mutual assistance and protection of its members; (2) to prevent strikes in the Railway service, this association having a 'no-strike clause' in its constitution; (3) to educate its members in the work and technicalities of their callings, classes being regularly held at all leading centres for this purpose. Therefore, in the interests of the public, the Railway Department, and the locomotive-men themselves, it is highly essential that official recognition should be extended to the petitioners' union. 5. It is in the interests of industrial peace that each trade or calling should be allowed to form a union and receive recognition from the employers. 6. The N.Z.L.E.D.F. & C. Association has branches throughout New Zealand, and each branch is composed wholly of locomotive-men who can discuss freely (without the interference of other departments' employees) the various matters which affect their callings. 7. The branch secretaries are also locomotive-men, and fully understand any matter emanating from the branch meetings, which has to be transmitted clearly to the executive body. 8. The executive council of the N.Z.L.E.D.F. & C. Association is also composed wholly of locomotive-men, who can discuss the matters placed in their hands without the interference of other departments' employees, who are in no way conversant with the technical work appertaining to the petitioners' callings. 9. The general secretary of the N.Z.L.E.D.F. & C. Association is also a locomotive-man, who thoroughly understands the various matters placed in his hands to be discussed with the head of his departments, and it is also in the interests of industrial peace that the general secretary of a union should be engaged in the callings he represents. 10. Therefore, under clauses 6, 7, 8, and 9, it must be admitted that a society composed of and worked by locomotive-men can more adequately represent any matter affecting their calling, and also deal with the matters in a more explicit manner than a conglomerate society, however it may be organized. 11. Under the above-mentioned circumstances a large amount of time will be saved to the departments' officers and the Minister, also, it would be the means of fostering a better feeling between the departments' officers and the men, which largely conduces to an efficient service. 12. It was stated by the Minister of Railways, on the 14th December, 1909 (*Hansard*, p. 1047), 'So far as the Railway Department was concerned it did not object to the proposal' [for the official recognition of this association] 'in the slightest.' In Australia the Railway Commissioners admit the locomotive unions render valuable assistance in working the railways, which fact was admitted by the Minister as the result of his recent visit. 13. It is also admitted that neither industrial nor political force is required to induce the Government, the Minister, or the Department's officers to redress any matter affecting the employees; therefore there is no necessity for all grades of the service to be in one union which cannot adequately represent all matters affecting the Railway employees. 14. The locomotive-engine drivers, firemen, and cleaners' associations are officially recognized in England, Scotland, Ireland, America, Argentine, Sweden, Africa, France, Germany, Austria, Italy, West Australia, South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania, and in almost every civilized country in the world, and it is considered necessary in the interests of public safety to allow these men official recognition and to associate for their own improvement. 15. As the locomotive-men have to come in contact with almost every person engaged in train-running, and it is very necessary for the locomotive-men to report other callings or persons for neglect of duty, &c., it is very desirable in the interests of the travelling public that they should not have to belong to a society of all grades, which, through above-mentioned causes, engenders an ill feeling towards the locomotive-men. 16. It is urged as an argument against our recognition that we should not be able as a union to accumulate sufficient money to defend an action such as the Rotorua or Bankside accidents, apart from the fact that we now have sufficient funds for such purposes. One of the objects of our union is to endeavour to prevent such accidents by impressing upon and

educating our members as to their responsible work, and not to build up a large fund to defend careless workmen. 17. As a proof that the New Zealand locomotive-engine drivers, firemen, and cleaners desire a union controlled and governed by an executive of locomotive-men only, we submit the following: The petitions were signed by about 1,110 locomotive-men out of an approximate 1,400, and 1,110 locomotive-men are members of the petitioners' union, and, lastly, about 250 locomotive-men signed a petition circulated by the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants for signatures of those desirous of having their grievances, &c., put through the A.S.R.S. 18 Summarized, the foregoing reasons prove conclusively that official recognition will bring about a more efficient service, harmony between officers and men, more conciliating means of redressing grievances, and will insure greater safety to the travelling public. 19 Every branch of the N.Z.L.E.D.F & C. Association (eighteen in number) has passed resolutions against the proposed departmental representation as suggested by the A.S.R.S., as such a scheme would only lead to a worse position for the locomotive-men in the service, class jealousy, and continual bickerings, and would not be such a useful body to the Railway Department as the E.F & C Association. 20. We have made an offer to the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants to federate with them, and such a scheme would allow the railwaymen to speak more authoritatively than at present, it would also include the Railway Officers' Institute, thereby producing a good feeling among the railway employees. The following is the context of the federation scheme, which allows the locomotive-men's union complete entity: (I) Objects That the objects of the federation shall be—it shall exist for the purpose of ventilating, furthering, or attaining such questions or objects as are of equal or general importance to all grades of railway workers, and shall endeavour to promote and assist all efforts to improve the general conditions of the Railway service. (II) Representation That the representation on the Federal Council be on a *pro rata* basis—that is, for every 1,000 members or part thereof, such part to be not less than 500, each union shall have one representative. (III) Matter for discussion: That no matter be discussed by the Federal Council without the approval of the federated bodies. (IV) Expenses: That all the expenses of the representatives on the Federal Council be paid on a *pro rata* basis, also all incidental expenses connected with the meeting of the Federal Council.—G. BROWN, President, S. KENNEDY, Vice-President, W MCARLEY, General Secretary ” We could not put the federation proposal any fairer than that, but I say that when we put the proposal before the society they treated the matter in a scandalous manner, and did not treat it as trades-unionism in any way. Considering the arguments that have been adduced to you to-day, I think they have been sufficient to cause you to recommend the House to officially recognize the Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association, and I think you will find that we should go hand in hand and work amicably together. I think there is sufficient room for the two unions to work amicably together, and I hope you will bring in a report favourable to our association.

THOMAS MILROY examined. (No. 6.)

1 *The Chairman.*] What is your occupation?—An engine-driver

2. Will you make your statement to the Committee?—Well, Mr Chairman and gentlemen, I do not know that I can add very much to what has already been said. I think the position has been clearly set out by Mr Russell, and also by Mr Kennedy and Mr McArley. There are, however, one or two small matters I wish to refer to. Our union has been in existence in Dunedin for some time, and has about 175 members. Our meetings are well attended, and altogether we are a very happy family. This cleavage between the society and our union took place very largely owing to the large expenses occurring through the Conferences held at Wellington and Auckland, while in many cases there was nothing gained at all by these Conferences. A great portion of our grievances have been ignored, and I dare say will be to the end. We considered that the £500 or £600 could be very much better spent in some other way. We got tired of handing in our contributions to the fund to be spent in that way, and we thought it would be better to have a union of our own, and consequently it was formed. What I desire to bring before the Committee is the fact that I have had the opportunity of making a trip round the world. I went through England, Scotland, and America, and in those places I found established similar societies to the one we have formed. I obtained introductions to a large number of engine-drivers and others, and naturally made inquiries and got some information in regard to their societies. They told me that their societies were working well, and laughed at the idea of the Amalgamated Society being able to represent men like engine-drivers in regard to the technicalities. I was informed that they had their schools, charts, and models, which were supplied to them by the Department, and which, of course, were of great benefit. There is one thing certain in America, and that is that the men there are pretty smart and well up to their business, and I have no doubt that is due to the opportunities that have been given to them in regard to technical education. There is no great gulf between the officers and men on the railways in America, and it seems to be the policy of the directors to have confidence in their men, and at the same time they send men along to educate them. We had the feeling that when we started our union we might reduce the gulf which exists here, and at the same time have better opportunities for educating the men in our section, and making them better informed in regard to their duties. With regard to the Amalgamated Society, I have been for a long time connected with it, and I have nothing against it. It is no doubt doing its best, and at the present time doing what it considers right. However, we wanted to collect our own money and to administer it, and get some benefit out of it in some way, and now that this cleavage has taken place I do not think there is the slightest chance of ever patching it up. At one time I thought it was possible, but there is not the remotest chance now. The Amalgamated Society decided to delete that clause whereby we could still have been members for something like 5s. a year, and then said, “If you cannot be with us the door is

closed. From that time our confidence was gone, and we thought the next best thing was to federate. We have nothing against the Amalgamated Society. It is simply standing for itself, the same as we are, but if it would endeavour to get into the society the large number of men in the workshops and on the permanent-way who do not belong to any union, it would have a very much stronger footing. We have a feeling that if unionism is worth anything it is worth paying for. Of course, as engine-drivers it is only natural that we should be kept in front—we are always in front—and you will no doubt realize that in this country or any other country scarcely anything can take place or happen to a train without the driver being implicated. The regulations are framed in such a way that it is almost impossible for an engine-driver to escape blame and punishment. Therefore it is absolutely necessary that these men should get together for their own benefit in order to discuss matters for their own welfare not only with their sympathy, but with their money. In connection with our union we have a sick benefit fund already, and at our last meeting the case of a young fellow who was very bad came up. This young fellow had been taken to the hospital, and we appointed visitors to visit him, and in due course the bill was passed for payment. Surely it is better for us to treat our members like that than to spend £500 or £600 on what are nothing more than pleasure trips as far as we are concerned. My time on the railway is pretty well up, and I should like to leave it, at any rate, up to date. We in New Zealand are up to date in most things, and I think we have as good railways and as well managed and safely run as any place in the world. I think, if we leave out England and Scotland, I question whether we have not got the best railways in the world, and I think we have as good a staff of men as any in the world. I do not think it is possible for you to find a better body of men anywhere, and I say that after picking up all the information I could when I was away. I came back to New Zealand perfectly satisfied, and glad that I lived in New Zealand, because I think it is without doubt the best country in the world, both for the people with money and for those who have to work. It is my opinion that the Amalgamated Society shut the door against us in the first instance, and I do not think there is the slightest possibility of the locomotive-men ever uniting again with that society. The whole cry along the line to-day is "No surrender," and I sincerely hope that our union will receive that recognition which we deserve. As long as I remain in the railways nothing will occur that will injure the Amalgamated Society if I can possibly prevent it. And, as I said before, if unionism is worth anything it is worth paying for, but there is a large body of men coming and going who practically do not contribute anything to it. I do not think that is fair, especially when you consider that those men can be got to go dead against us in the matter of voting. As there is no possibility of repairing the breach that has taken place, the only thing is to grant us recognition. I am sure the two societies will get along all right, and it will be no disadvantage to the railways or the management. There is another point I should like to mention, and that is in regard to the hundreds of little things that may occur in the running of a train and the work generally. If this matter was fixed up you could go to your officers and explain anything that goes wrong, but if you are in the union you cannot very well do that; and that is one of the greatest reasons why we should be granted this recognition. Our interests are identically the same as those of the Amalgamated Society, we are not against that society in any way, but with them in every possible way. This bickering has been going on for two years and a half, and I sincerely hope that our union will be recognized and the whole matter fixed up.

3 *Mr Hine.*] Do you refer to casual hands when you say that some come and go and contribute very little?—For instance, take the mechanics in the different workshops, they come on, and are later on put off. If there is no work they cannot be kept on, and a large portion of those men belong to other societies outside.

WILLIAM McARLEY further examined (No. 7)

- 1 *Mr Veitch.*] Does your association publish a magazine known as the *Loco Record*?—Yes.
2. Who is the printer of the *Loco Record*?—Mr Russell.
3. Has your association a contract with the printer for the printing?—The executive council does that. I have not got the necessary knowledge to answer the question.
4. Do you mean to say that you do not know whether your association has a contract with the printer or not?—I am not aware of any contract.
5. Who is the editor of the *Record*? and is such editor paid for his services?—The executive council.
6. *The Chairman.*] I think, myself, the question is somewhat irrelevant to the subject before the Committee.
- 7 *Mr Veitch.*] Are the articles that appear in the *Loco Record*, or any of such articles, submitted before publication to the printers for consideration, or to any person connected with the printers?—I will appeal to the Chairman whether that is a fair question.
8. *The Chairman.* I think the question is irrelevant.

(No. 8.)

*Mr G W Russell, M.P.* I wish to make a statement, Mr Chairman, in regard to the questions put to Mr McArley. I wish to state that I am a printer, and also managing director of the firm of G. W. Russell (Limited), printers and publishers of the *Spectator* in Christchurch. The Locomotive-engine Drivers' Association asked my firm to quote a price for the printing of a magazine called the *Loco Record*. An issue was printed, and they then asked what the cost of it would be if continued for twelve months. A price was given, but no contract was entered into. The whole of the matter that appears in that paper is supplied by Mr McArley, the general secretary. I have never written one line for that paper, and I am not paid as editor. My firm receives

nothing but the mere cost for printing the paper, and I have never been paid one sixpence for literary services by the Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association. I make that statement, and I desire it to be placed before the Committee, because I consider that an exceedingly ungenerous attempt is being made to make it appear that I am being paid by the Locomotive-engine Drivers' Association for services rendered to them as a literary man. There is absolutely no truth in the statement, and I consider it is absolutely unwarranted, and an unfair suggestion to be brought before this Committee.

WILLIAM ANDREW VEITCH examined. (No. 9.)

1 *The Chairman.*] What are you?—An engine-driver at Wanganui.

2. Will you make a statement to the Committee giving your reasons why you oppose the recognition of the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association?—Yes. Mr Chairman and gentlemen,—The business that we are discussing to-day appears to me to be very much like going over the ground that we went over last year. Your Committee last year heard the evidence on both sides, and after full consideration of the matter reported to the House favourable to us. You reported that you had no recommendation to make to Parliament. Now, the facts have not materially changed since then. The facts to-day are practically the same as they were then, with the exception that we have complied with the suggestion given to us by the Railways Committee in its report. The Committee reported to Parliament as follows: "That by internal reorganization of the society the petitioners could always get direct representation on the executive of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. We have complied with that suggestion, and put that into operation. We have had arguments from the gentlemen opposed to us, and I must say, to begin with, that I appreciate the manner in which they have discussed their side of the question. There has been altogether an entire absence of acrimony, and I am pleased to note that fact. However, it is not a question of what their intentions are—we have never charged them with having evil intentions against the Amalgamated Society, but as practical men we have to consider what effect it will have upon the railwaymen of New Zealand if what they are asking for is granted to them. It is all very well for those men to say, We wish the Amalgamated Society well, we propose and intend to work in harmony with it if we are officially recognized—that is all right, but what about the experience of other countries where this system is in operation? I say this unhesitatingly: that in other countries there has not been that harmony between those sections that these men claim has existed. We have ample evidence to prove that. We find that when one section of a union makes an attempt to improve the service conditions of its members it fails very often under that system. Then they begin to blame other branches of the service for having pushed their claims in opposition and having prevented their success. It is a very common thing to have the management of different railway companies at Home working off one branch of the service against the other, and this is how it works out. They possibly do not intend to do anything of the kind, but that is the effect. Say the locomotive-men make a move to improve the conditions of their men, and what happens? Directly they make a move the other unions find they must be up and doing, and they begin to push their claims forward, and the management find themselves up against four different unions all working for something different. The result is that the management, although they might be favourable to granting some of the claims made by the locomotive-men, would say, "If we do this we are going to fall into trouble with all the other unions, and therefore we are not going to do anything for any of them." I do not think the position has been put altogether as clearly as it might be. A great deal has been said, and a great deal of capital has been made out of the argument that the Amalgamated Society has failed in its duty to the locomotive-men, that no progress has been made by the locomotive-men—that is to say, that their service conditions to-day are no better than they were twenty years ago. Now, I am very sorry to have to refer to this. It is a pity to see the representatives of two trades-unions appealing to the representatives of their employers, the people, and using such arguments as those. Here am I in the position to-day that I am compelled to argue that a great deal has been done for the locomotive-men, when, as a trades-unionist, it would be far better for me not to argue on those lines at all. That I say in itself is a strong argument against the sectionalizing of unionism in the Railway Department. Now, I desire to read to you a memorial that was sent to the Minister of Public Works by the locomotive-men in the South Island before the Amalgamated Society was started, and I will ask you to consider the grievances set out in that letter and compare them with the existing conditions of the Locomotive Department to-day, and see from them whether you are prepared to agree with Mr. Kennedy that nothing has been done for the locomotive-men.

*Mr Kennedy* I did not make that statement.

*Witness* It has been argued that practically no progress has been made by the locomotive-men, that their service conditions have not been improved, and that their interests have been neglected by the society. I claim that has been the burden of their song from the beginning. This is the letter: "We, the undersigned drivers and firemen of the Hurunui-Bluff Section of the New Zealand Railways, respectfully beg to submit for your favourable consideration the under-mentioned grievances which we are now subjected to, some of which are consequent upon the non-adherence to the revised scale, as submitted by the Government and accepted by us, bearing date 4th September, 1880, and particularized in clause 1. The other hardships are specified in clauses from 1 to 5, and are of much longer standing, particularly clause 2, which has obtained for a considerable period, but not to the extent as at present. Clause 1: The above-mentioned scale provides that 23 per cent. of drivers employed who have served a period of five years in that capacity shall receive the sum of 13s. per day, and shall rank as first-class drivers. Up to the present, in no single instance to our knowledge has this provision been complied with. This has

a discouraging effect upon us as a body, seeing that our oldest and best drivers are at present ranking as second-class drivers, through the withholding of this well-merited promotion. Provision is also made for junior drivers to commence at 10s. 6d. per day this is not adhered to, as 10s. is substituted in lieu thereof, thus entailing an additional 5 per cent. reduction upon them. Clause 2 The scale provides lodging-allowance for drivers and firemen when absent from their homes on duty; but we are sorry to state that in many instances this is left unpaid. Clause 3: Clause 399, Rules and Regulations, New Zealand Railways, reads, 'If an engineman or fireman be not required for his full time upon the line, he is to employ the remainder of his time in the shop, under shop rules, and at such work as the foreman may give him.' Instead of the above-quoted clause being carried into effect, there is a system obtaining called 'booking off,' the said booking off consisting of being simply told by the foreman that our services are not required until further notice. This system of booking off has been going on for the past eighteen months, but not to the extent practised for the last four months. During that period some of us have lost from two to eight days during the four-weekly periods. We therefore specially draw your attention to what we consider an unjust system, causing to us a serious pecuniary loss. Clause 4: We would also respectfully call your attention to the unreasonable number of hours there are required of us for a fair day's work—viz., from eleven to thirteen hours at present—this being the slackest season of the year. During the busy time, commencing with the wool season in November and ending with the grain season in the latter part of May, the hours, as a rule, are from thirteen to seventeen per day; thus from three to seven hours' overtime is worked daily, for which we get from one-eighth to a quarter of a day overtime. In the case of shunting-engines, in certain cases no overtime is allowed if we are out twenty hours per day. We humbly beg that these hours of duty be reduced to ten hours, as we are not desirous of working any overtime, even if we are paid for it. If our petition in this matter be granted, all men in the department will be satisfied, and the clause *re* booking off will be obviated, as all hands would be fully employed. But when the interest of the Department is concerned, we do not object to work a reasonable number of hours, providing we are remunerated at the rate of time and a quarter, as per scale, for all time worked over ten hours, the said ten hours to constitute a day's work. Clause 5: Lastly, there is one more hardship under which we suffer—that is, we are not allowed any holidays during the year, not being paid for Christmas, New Year's Day, Good Friday, or the Queen's Birthday unless on duty. This is, in our opinion, unfair, because if we are correctly informed other Departments of the Civil Service are paid for those days whether on duty or not. Trusting that you will take the above into your favourable consideration, we have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient humble servants." Now comparing the grievances presented by those men to the Minister of Public Works at that time with the grievances we present to the management now, and pushing harder for their redress, I think you will agree with me that progress has been made, and that the Amalgamated Society has done its best. I have been brought to task by the members of the association because I said, when we were last before the Committee, that we had no power to enforce the redress of grievances, we can only put them to the management, and ask the management to grant the concessions asked for. It was said that that was a great weakness, and, as Mr Kennedy and others said, those grievances must be rectified; but there is nothing in that argument at all, because we have not power to force the position. I brought that forward to try and prove to the Committee that the Amalgamated Society has done its duty to the locomotive-men. Now, I desire to read to you a letter which we received from the locomotive society, and in view of what has transpired since, I am rather puzzled as to what the meaning of it is. The letter states, "To General Secretary, A.S.R.S., Wellington.—DEAR SIR,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 6th instant, and in reply to mine of 26th April *re* federation. In answer to your council's request for fuller information on the propositions, I have much pleasure in submitting for your council's consideration a rough draft of our grand council's meetings. On pages 10 and 11 will be found what the grand council considered was the principle on which a scheme of federation could be drawn up between the two unions. It was agreed by the grand council to allow the delegates appointed to work on these lines, and, when a definite scheme was arranged between the two unions, to place a detailed account before them for final approval. As you will observe, our grand council hold office continuously until the next grand council meetings; therefore no delay will take place in getting their final approval. I should also be very pleased to receive a copy of your amended rules to meet the views of this association. Further, I am directed to state that the grand council and council of this association are anxious to formulate a workable scheme, which in itself will represent a 'united Railway service,' but at the same time will allow the locomotive-men power to send their own choice to represent their grievances before the Minister and management. My council also regrets that any ill feelings should have been engendered by the formation of a separate union for locomotive-men, but it gives them much pleasure to say that that feeling has completely passed away and your union, whether federated or otherwise, can always be assured of their loyal support in furthering the interests of railwaymen generally. I should be very pleased to receive a draft of your amended rules before Sunday, the 15th May, 1910, to place before a full council, which meets on that date.' Now gentlemen, what our society has done is this: We have altered our constitution, and brought it to conform to the wishes expressed in that letter. There can be no doubt of that. They say, "We are anxious to formulate a workable scheme which in itself will represent a 'united service,' but at the same time will allow the locomotive-men power to send their own choice to represent their grievances before the Minister and management." We have amended our constitution, and the rules of our society now provide that the locomotive-men will directly elect their representatives to our council. Now, I am not going to take up a one-sided view, and I am going to look at the position in this light: There is a dispute between two parties, the locomotive association has petitioned Parliament and are doing their very utmost. No doubt, they are doing what they think is right. I have no idea

of imputing any unworthy motives to them. They are fighting for one end, and we are fighting for another. Now, a dispute has arisen between two parties, and does it not seem reasonable that a compromise should be brought about between those two parties? It seems to me that is the only solution of the difficulty, and that is what we are anxious to do. It has been published in the *Loco Record* that our efforts in this direction have amounted to dirty work. I fail to see that there has been any dirty work. There is no intention on our part to do anything dirty, or unfair, or improper. What we want to do is to settle this difficulty. We realize that if railwaymen once divide we shall never get them together again. The existence of sectional agencies creates irritation, and therefore it may be impossible to get the men together again. Is it not a thousand times better that we should stand together as we have done in the past? It has taken twenty years' hard work and self-sacrifice on the part of railwaymen to build the union up to its present state of efficiency, and I think it will be a great mistake to do anything that will injure that society. At the present time we have many grievances we are trying to remedy, and if the Minister was here he would be quite willing to admit that the grievances of locomotive-men have been strongly urged on him on every occasion we have met him. We have had locomotive-men on the council who have dealt with locomotive grievances, and they have done their level best, and with all due respect to those gentlemen who are opposing us, and who are anxious to take that work up, I assure them that they could do no better. You cannot go into the Minister's office and demand that such-and-such a thing shall be done. If we had the power to do that it would be a bad thing for the country, and we do not want that power, but the fact remains that we must have some protection and some power for our men. Where would be the protection the railwaymen have to-day if we took away from them their strong union? I say there is absolutely no protection given them by the Classification Act. There are the regulations under that Act, and on every occasion we meet the Minister we have to make complaints that those regulations are not being complied with. Now, where is our protection? Supposing the Minister of Railways says,

I have not got the money, and I am not going to pay the money out, where is our power to enforce adherence to those regulations? We should have no power and, notwithstanding the fact that a great deal has been said of a disparaging nature in regard to the necessity for retaining our political power, I venture to say that the railwaymen of New Zealand have absolutely no power of defence but their political power exercised through the A.S.R.S. and that is very much curtailed by their not having the full rights of citizenship the same as other members of the community. Unions outside of the Government service have far more protection than we have. Those are our reasons for trying to keep our hands together. Those who are older hands in the service know how many of our old hands suffered severely in their efforts to establish our union. I can give you cases of men who were persecuted out of the service at that time owing to the fact that they took a leading part in society matters. We have our duty to do to those who have run our union in the past, to those who are in our Railway service to-day, and to those who are going to be members of the Railway service in the future, and I consider it is the duty of the Amalgamated Society to hold the men together, for the reason that we must find protection for the railwaymen in the future. I say that the health and happiness of all railwaymen in the future depends very materially on the decision that this Committee comes to with regard to this very important matter—in fact, this all-important matter to the railwaymen. Expressions of good will from the men opposing us are of no use. We believe them, and we accept these expressions with pleasure, but expressions of good will to-day will not in any way nullify the evil effect of breaking up our union. We feel that it is our duty to meet these men as far as we can possibly meet them. We feel that it is absolutely necessary now that we should come to some arrangement whereby this difficulty will be overcome, but we think it is only fair, seeing that we have made two steps in the direction of meeting them in order to come to a compromise—that it is only reasonable and fair that they should take one step to meet us. We have complied with the sentiments expressed in their letter, and we have complied with the recommendation of the Railways Committee as contained in their report in regard to direct representation. I do not know of anything else we can do to bring about a settlement or to meet these men other than to give way to them absolutely and withdraw our resistance to their recognition. Now, we should be prepared to do even that, and prepared to do it willingly, if we did not fully realize that such a step would result in great disaster to the railwaymen in the future. We have our duty to do, and we must do it. The Hon. the Minister of Railways, in addressing the House concerning this matter, said, "There must be one society only. Whether it would be of advantage to the society or not, there was no doubt in his mind that, once they started this breaking-away it would mean breaking away in many more directions than this, and that would undoubtedly tend to a weakening of the society both politically and otherwise." (See *Hansard* No. 20, Second Session, 1909, page 1047.) Those are the opinions expressed by the Minister in the House, and I quite agree with him. I shall now be as brief as possible with what I have to say; but I wish to reply particularly to what Mr. Russell said, as I look upon him as the leader of this movement, and I should like to say this—that the matter of the locomotive-men's grievances is not the most important aspect of the case, it is a matter now of holding our men together. And the interests of other branches of the service should also be considered. I claim you must have but one system, either the sectional system or the amalgamated system. If we are going to have the sectional system, surely it is only fair that all branches and all members of the Railway service should have a say in the matter of whether the union should be divided into sections or not. Is it fair that the fate of the whole of the railwaymen in New Zealand should be left in the hands of a section of the Locomotive Branch? I do not think it is. I think it is only right that whatever system is to be adopted should first be approved by the great majority of the railwaymen. The whole of this locomotive agitation has been worked up on a misunderstanding. First of all it was said that under sectionalism the men were very much better off; and yet we have admissions in their own paper that the men in

Australia are not so highly paid as in New Zealand. This agitation is in the interest of the first-grade driver. We have had agitations all along for Australian conditions, and if you compare all the Australian States you will find that the firemen there are very badly paid, but in some of the States the drivers get more pay as compared with the New Zealand drivers, but taking the drivers all through they too are very badly paid indeed. If the locomotive association got the Australian conditions they agitated for, no doubt one effect would be to reduce the lower-paid men not only in the other branches of our service, but also the lower-paid men in the locomotive service, and nobody would gain anything by that except the first-grade drivers, and I, for one, am not going to push forward the interests of a few men to the detriment of a large body of men. While I am prepared to admit that the driver of a passenger-train has a great responsibility, still I say this: that there is hardly one man in the service who is paid for the responsibility he has. It is quite different from financial responsibility and you will agree with me that the whole of the service is poorly paid from the General Manager down. Then why should we not stick together and help to improve our conditions in a proper way, instead of fighting each other, as we are doing at the present time. It would have pleased me much better to have appeared before you as representative of the whole of the service, bringing before you some grievances. I am sure that would be better for the whole service instead of bickering over disputes between ourselves, because after all it is only a question of how we should fight. Mr Kennedy and others said we are opposed to the direct departmental-representation system, and he is quite correct. I have always opposed that system, and Mr Wilson is in the same position. Does not that fact alone prove that we have tried to compromise with them? And that is what we are trying to prove to you now. We have done our best to meet them; we have sunk our individual opinions, and we think this individual-representation system is not the best one. The arguments about the technicalities of the Locomotive Department not being understood by them is a myth. The General Manager of Railways has scarcely had a case from the A.S.R.S. in which the technicalities of locomotive work have come into the question at all—it is purely a matter of the service conditions and regulations. We find that the technicalities of the locomotive work do not come in to any great extent in discussing locomotive grievances with the management. When they do we have locomotive-men who are capable of dealing with them. My own opinion is that it would be better if we had no direct representation. We are anxious to meet these men and come to a compromise. As I said, we have given way; we have done what in our opinion would be better left undone in the hope that by giving way part of the principle we should avoid losing the whole. That is our object, and I appeal to this Committee and to them to try and take that view of the matter, and realize that when there is a dispute between two parties either side must give way a little before it is possible to come to a settlement. Then, and not till then, shall we be able to go on with the work of getting back what was taken from us during the retrenchment, and of working to improve the conditions of the railwaymen in New Zealand. Now, Mr Russell has made a good deal of the statement in the General Manager's report that, so far as the Railway Department is concerned, they have no objection to the recognition of the union. That is purely a non-committal statement. The General Manager simply means by that that he is prepared to abide by the decision of Parliament, and to do his best according to any system that Parliament may decide upon. That is really what it amounts to, but it does not mean at all, and does not intend to convey, the idea that the General Manager is favourable to the recognition of this separate union.

*Mr Russell:* He is not against it.

*Mr Veitch:* I am sorry my time is so limited, because there is so much I wish to refer to. I can only conclude, Mr Chairman, by saying that I reciprocate the good feeling expressed by these men towards me personally, and I hope, whatever the decision of this Committee may be, that we shall be able to come to an arrangement that will settle this very unwise and expensive fight that is going on. There is no doubt about it in my own mind that we should come to some arrangement. I am ready to meet them this afternoon, and discuss the position with them with the idea of coming to some settlement. I did my best to prevent this matter being fought out in the political arena—it is not fair to members of the Committee and not fair to ourselves that we should be here fighting over our internal differences at all. I am sure, if we met in a generous spirit and discussed the position amongst ourselves, that the men fighting on each side could come to a settlement. I sincerely hope that in the interests of the railwaymen of New Zealand you will retain the Amalgamated Society intact, because I claim that it is the only protection the railwaymen have. We are very anxious indeed to do our duty and to keep our men together, in order that the society may not go back. I am sure that since the fight has started our service conditions have gone back, and before that we did nothing but make improvements. What, then, would be the position if we permanently divide? I maintain that the railwaymen in New Zealand would have to pay very dearly for it indeed.

MATTHEW JOSEPH MACK examined. (No. 10)

1 *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants.

2 Will you make a statement to the Committee in regard to the petition presented by your society?—Sir, I am somewhat at a loss upon this occasion, for the simple reason that I fully expected at the outset that we should have been supplied with some fresh evidence in support of the petition presented by the Locomotive-engine Drivers' Association; but I find, sir, upon listening to the evidence that has already been given, that there is nothing of an important nature further than that which was previously presented to your Committee. I am somewhat unaccustomed to, and do not know, the rules of parliamentary procedure, and more particularly with regard to the



Committees of this honourable House, but, sir, it seems to me somewhat extraordinary that before what is the highest tribunal in this land counsel has been refused. More particularly, sir, am I surprised when I find that a member of Parliament, in his official capacity as such, and one who, if not directly, is indirectly interested, has seen fit to advocate the cause—

3. *The Chairman.*] I am afraid I shall have to prevent you pursuing your argument on those lines. I have explained that any member of Parliament who presents a petition can come before the Committee and speak in support of that petition. You have the same right, and all the members who presented petitions on your behalf may come here and speak in support of those petitions?—We were unaware of that.

4. It was also explained by Mr Russell that he was not here as an interested party, but as a member who presented petitions?—But had we been aware of that fact we could have had a counter-petition presented by a gentleman who would have acted in the same capacity for us as Mr Russell is acting on behalf of these men. However, I wish, sir that that will be recorded, because I feel keenly, and I wish to enter my protest. Now, sir with regard to what Mr Russell has said in favour of the petitioners—that is, that legislation shall be introduced to enable official recognition to be given to the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association—if that is done it means that the legal right which has been held by our society up to the present time shall be limited, and the right to represent the locomotive-men by our society taken away from us. Notwithstanding the fact that it has been stated by our opponents that we have only a very few men in our society, I may tell you, sir, that we have at the present time 764 locomotive-men in our society, and, further than that, I would point out that of the 764 there are no less than 354 enginemen in our society out of 497 available, showing that only 144 experienced enginemen, the men who have been through the mill and know what the Amalgamated Society has done for them, have seen fit to go out of our society. Now, it has been urged that we have not taken advantage of that clause in the Act which gives us the right to obtain an industrial agreement. I would ask our opponents now, sir, if they had the right to go before the Court, would they do so? They know perfectly well they would not, because there is a clause in the Act which says that the Court shall be bound by the schedule to the Classification Act, and the Court therefore is limited, and cannot give an increase higher than the men are receiving, because they are at the present time receiving the maximum. But, sir, if Parliament should see fit to wipe out that clause, I have no doubt that you will have numerous applications to come before the Arbitration Court. Now, a great deal has been made by Mr Russell and other members with regard to the "no-strike" clause, the bogey of the no-strike clause has been raised. Why, sir, it is ridiculous. First of all he also makes a point of the Federation of Labour which is growing, and that if the Amalgamated Society can remain intact there is no knowing what may happen—a great industrial upheaval. He is not cognizant of the fact that in the terms of recognition entered into between the Government and our society affiliation is prohibited—we are not allowed to affiliate. But, sir, if those terms of recognition are broken by the Government themselves, then we are not responsible. If they break faith with us, then we shall have to consider our position, and consider whether, in the interests of our members, we shall not have to take some other steps to strengthen our position. But, sir so long as it remains intact we are prepared to go along as we have gone. Those terms of recognition have been faithfully kept by the General Manager and ourselves during the past sixteen years. Now, we have been accused of looking after the low-paid men to the exclusion of the higher-paid men. I would just like to ask, sir, if any member of this Committee or any member of the Locomotive Association has ever taken the trouble to average the rate of wages per hour received fifteen years ago with the rate of wages per hour received to-day. For the benefit of this Committee, sir I will tell you what they were. The man who received 6s. 6d. a day at that time received 9½d. per hour, to-day he receives 1s. per hour but, owing to the decrease in the hours of the locomotive staff, the amount has risen from 1s. 4d. at that time to 1s. 6¾d. per hour. When that is taken upon an eight-hours basis you will find that the increase on a percentage basis is very much higher than has probably been the case in any other branch of the service. Now, we have been invited by Mr Russell to take as an instance the Government Printing Office, and that it would be ridiculous to say that they should all be in the one society. Why, sir the Government Printing Office men have their respective unions registered under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, and they can go and get an award and have the rates fixed. If this petition is given effect to, what is to prevent a carpenter, and bricklayer, and blacksmith in the service joining the particular branches of their union which are under the Conciliation Act, and then petitioning Parliament for official recognition? Then, sir, with division comes ultimate subdivision. We have had it in America and Germany and all over the world. Why, sir, take America—there they have division and they have a drivers' association of their own, and in Germany only recently they formed an association of drivers, enginemen, and cleaners, and only a short time ago the drivers said to the cleaners, "You go out, we want an association of our own", with the result that those two bodies of men, although engaged in the same business, are at one another's throats. We have been told that in countries where locomotive associations are in existence they have been of great benefit to the men. Now, sir, Australia has been illustrated, New South Wales has been spoken of as being one of the highest-paid States in Australia. What are the conditions in New South Wales? Let me read to you a report I have, not written by any member of the Amalgamated Society, but written by the secretary of the New South Wales Locomotive Association. It states, 'As far as the internal working of its association is concerned, there is but little to report—a few minor concessions have been secured and thus it has more than held its own. But there are some old standing grievances not yet remedied, the principal of which are weekly computation of time and Sunday time independent of the week's work. These are taken from us in time of depression with a promise of restoration when better times come. Yet, although the railway revenues for several years past show large surpluses, we have been unable to obtain justice in these respects. The remaining

grievances are of a minor character, which are in some respects a disgrace to a large and prosperous Department. The abnormal increase of traffic in New South Wales has created a large increase in the running staff, and consequently increased membership of the association.' Those, sir, are the words of the secretary of the Locomotive Association of New South Wales. What do we learn from that? We learn, also, that they have not yet got a forty-eight-hours week. That may seem to be an exaggerated statement, but, sir, I will give you proof and the proof is again Mr Hollis, the secretary of the New South Wales Locomotive Association. It is as follows: 'That Sunday work be paid for at one-and-a-quarter rates, and to be overtime independent of the fortnight's work. That all time worked in any one day over that asked for as excessive hours—viz., eight hours and a half on passenger-trains and ten hours on goods-trains or shunting-engines or in or about the locomotive sheds—and all time worked over fifty-two hours in any one week, shall be paid at one-and-a-quarter rates and as overtime, independent of the twelve days per fortnight.' Then, sir, the next clause I wish this Committee to take particular notice of—'That in all cases where such employees are ready, able, and willing for duty they shall be paid not less than twelve days per fortnight, irrespective of Sunday work.' Just imagine, sir and in the hotbed of the locomotive association, where they have all their own way, where it is claimed that they have benefited the men, that they have not yet got a forty-eight-hours week, and that Sunday time does not stand by itself, and then that time-and-a-quarter rates are asked for. Compare that with New Zealand with its definite forty-eight-hours week, compare that, sir, with overtime at rate and a quarter and Sunday standing by itself at time and a half; and yet we are told that the Amalgamated Society has done nothing for the locomotive-men. Here is another letter from Mr Hollis:

I am directed respectfully to ask your remedy for hardship imposed on Driver ———, of Junee, whereby in two pay periods he lost three days' pay, and consequently was paid short that amount. This was owing to his being booked off duty away from his home station and for the convenience of the Department. In each case he was at the barracks waiting on call; but his services were not availed of. The particulars are—On October 11th he was at Goulburn, on November 15th at Narrandera, and on November 19th at Harden. Away from his home he was on extra expense, and it is submitted that under such circumstances a man should not be paid less than twelve days per period.—Assured of your consideration, I have, &c., ROBERT HOLLIS. Now, sir, that was on the 9th February, 1910. Is that not sufficient proof to show this Committee that locomotive associations have not been to the benefit of these men, and that in this country, where we have had amalgamation for the last twenty years, the men have increased accordingly? We have been told that they have been neglected, and yet we find the conditions of other countries are far behind our own. Now, sir, I have another letter here which I should like to read to you. It is a letter written by a man who has now unfortunately gone to the great beyond, but this was his experience:

'I am sending you under separate cover two copies of our Staff Regulations, with some recent amendments, as requested. I cannot supply you with the locomotive society's balance-sheet, but I will ask their general secretary to do so. They are not too well off to make known such matters. As to the senseless—I might say criminal—act of your locomotive-men in attempting to divide your association, it utterly confounds me. They cannot know the disastrous effects upon us in Australia this sectionalism has worked. You will find, whatever the present arguments, professions, and protestations are, that division means ultimate subdivisions, every one of which is another vampire sucking the life-blood from unionism. Time was, twenty years ago, when we were all in one union like our New Zealand comrades to-day, but, alas! the drivers, firemen, and cleaners separated themselves first, and now we are cursed with six distinct organizations in Brisbane, each with its own executive and officers—namely, stationmasters, assistant stationmasters, locomotive-men, guards, amalgamated, which is open to all grades, and a few months back three or four men have, after much trouble, started a new Traffic Association, and its membership is limited to wages-men of the Traffic Department. This last consists chiefly of men persuaded from the other unions, so that they have organized those who were already organized, whilst the great majority of our men remain aloof from any union, excusing themselves on the ground of our little petty sections of 'Tooley Street tailors' called 'unions.' Mr J Walker, Cross Creek, Wellington, one of your ex-presidents, whom I happen to know, will surely throw himself into the prevention of such a catastrophe befalling your association as this division portends. God help you if you begin dividing, for surely will your strength and usefulness begin to ebb away, because with weakness comes dissatisfaction and further subdivision; while one section is played against the other by the officials until 'Ichabod' is written upon your escutcheon—The glory is departed.' Fight this to the death, and prevent the thin end of the wedge at all cost.—Yours fraternally, T. HALE.' Those are the words of a man who had years of experience in Australia, and I think it should be sufficient to satisfy the railwaymen of this country that their interests can best be served by throwing their energies into one organization and working for one common good. Now, sir, the question of federation has been brought before this Committee. The federation proposals were passed in September of last year, but we did not receive those proposals until eight months later, when the Conference of the association had gone by. However, we immediately began to make a determined and sincere attempt to meet these men, but what was the result? Why, sir, Mr Russell, for the association, says we were "like drowning men grasping at a shadow." He said we had treated their correspondence in a scandalous manner. And that was because we put a conciliatory article in the *Review*, which is here for the perusal of the Committee. They immediately said that all negotiations were off, and that any further proposals must come from the Amalgamated Society. Now, sir, my time is just about up and I should like to say this: that we informed the Premier of what had been done, and he said, "The legitimate reasons for a separate society are now removed." And in reply to a question as to whether he thought it was a fair thing, the Hon. Mr Millar said, "I do not see that they would want a society at all then: they would elect their own representatives to the executive to meet as a whole," and he has also

said that it would be weakening the society both politically and otherwise. (See *Hansard* No. 20, 1909, p. 1047.) We have been twitted with the fact that we have still work enough left to enrol another five thousand members. I may tell you, sir, that to-day our society has more than the permanent staff of the Second Division, between 5s. and 12s. 6d. a day, in our ranks. We have actually more of the permanent staff in our ranks than what is claimed, and that is upon the figures of Mr. Millar himself, according to *Hansard* No. 12, page 325, 1910. I think I have said sufficient to satisfy any reasonable man that the locomotive associations in other countries have not been efficient, and I can assure you that, if the prayer of this petition is granted, the trouble, instead of ending, will be just about commencing. I thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, for the patient hearing you have given me.

*The Chairman* I wish to point out at this stage that there will be nothing to prevent any member of Parliament coming along and speaking on behalf of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. Of course, there will not be time to-day, but a member can come along at any time and get his evidence taken down.

*Witness* I am not objecting to Mr. Russell giving evidence. What I am objecting to is Mr. Russell acting as an advocate. I venture to say that we could have produced a man from our own ranks who could have acted as an advocate quite apart from legal counsel.

*Mr. Russell* I am here as a member of Parliament in charge of a petition, and not as an advocate.

*Witness* We understood that we should be confined to the order of reference as supplied to us.

*The Chairman:* We are not listening to any objection to your presence, Mr. Russell; you are here as a member of the House, and the Committee places that construction on your presence.

WILLIAM THOMAS WILSON examined. (No. 11.)

1 *The Chairman.*] What are you?—An engine-driver

2 Will you make a statement to the Committee in regard to the petition from the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants?—I should like to say, Mr. Chairman, that in connection with this matter so much ground has been covered that there are very few new points in connection with the subject-matter that I can touch upon. However, there are one or two references which have been made by the gentlemen who have spoken in support of the petition from the Engine-drivers and Firemen's Association that I cannot allow to pass without making some reference to. I may say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that I am one who holds this opinion: that, although steadfastly opposed to the idea of a new organization such as is proposed by the petitioners, I am one who, although I possess and claim the right of an opinion of my own, and a perfect right to express that opinion, wants the same respect given to me for the opinion I hold that I am prepared to concede to other people. I am opposing this petition to-day, Mr. Chairman, because I honestly and conscientiously believe it not to be in the best interests of the railway servants as a whole, and diametrically opposed to that particular department from which the membership of this organization has emanated. I want to make myself perfectly clear on that point. Now, during the discussion this morning it was openly stated that one of the reasons why this new association had been formed was because the men concerned were dissatisfied with the methods that had been adopted, and that the people who were dissatisfied were the people who were in the best position to judge as to whether their interests had been well looked after or not. Those perhaps are not the exact words that were used, but words were given vent to this morning to that effect. I prefer not to mention names, it perhaps causes a little feeling where feeling can be avoided, but words to that effect were used. I am going to take on myself the rôle of an authority. I simply say that I claim here conscientiously that I am in the position of a judge as to whether due consideration has been given to the grievances of the men in the Locomotive Department or whether they have not, and in support of my contention I will say this—that I have attended, commencing at the 1894 Conference and concluding with the 1910 Conference—with the exception of one of those Conferences I have attended every one. I say this: that I am in a far better position to judge as to whether those men have received due consideration in connection with the requests that have been put forward, and to which the utmost importance has been attached by the men who were not there at all. I claim that without any egotism, and what I have said is a fact. It has been stated also during the discussion this morning that, owing to the vast number of lower-paid men as compared with the drivers, a feeling has crept up in the direction of preventing the drivers getting an increase of pay, for the sole purpose of endeavouring to increase the pay of the lower-paid men. Now, I am prepared to admit this—that in the conduct of the business of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants this practice has been adopted, that there has been a certain amount of give and take. We have laid our heads together at times when we have been in the position that we felt sure that we could get one of a number of requests we put forward, or, say, two of a number, and decided that it was preferable to obtain the greatest good for the greatest number. And, as far as that is concerned, the locomotive-men's interests have not been neglected, and the statement that was made here this morning to the effect that it was because of the lower-paid men that they were not getting fair play is totally opposed to fact. I wish also to say that in all my experience at the Conferences, and as a member of the executive council for a number of years, also as representative at deputations numbering something like fifty or sixty to the Minister and General Manager, I have never seen an instance of selfishness which would support the contention that separate representation should be given to the engine-drivers. I simply mention this fact because I feel in duty bound to do so. I have seen a total absence of selfishness. It will be admitted that the locomotive-men have made some headway, and, speaking after twenty-eight years' experience, I would ask this question: Whether any individual members of the Locomotive Department are prepared to go back to the conditions

prevailing prior to the recognition of our society in 1894. I also ask this question, Does any member who is supporting the petition on behalf of the Drivers and Firemen's Association deny the fact that prior to that time the locomotive-men were called upon to work anything up to 100 or even in odd cases 120 hours a week without overtime? Do they deny that since then the time has been gradually reduced to sixty, fifty-four, and forty-eight hours a week? And are they not willing to admit that some little advantage has been gained in the matter of wages? I do not want to argue that we are well off, or that we are as well off as we ought to be, but we are a great deal better off through the instrumentality of the Amalgamated Society than before it came into existence. I wish to emphasize that, and could call evidence to prove it. I am also certain that further progress is more likely to be brought about by such a society as we have than if we split up into sections. Now, we have had a statement made with regard to the locomotive-men who are appearing as opponents to the petition which has been presented by the drivers and firemen, that were a vote to be taken by the locomotive-men they would not secure a majority of the members sufficient to appoint them as representatives. I am not going to argue on that point at all, because so far as that is concerned I am not troubled about it, but I am prepared to say this: that while members make a statement to that effect, which means practically that if Mr Veitch and myself were to submit ourselves for election we should be defeated, I am just as much justified in saying that if the other men were to submit themselves for election they would be defeated also. That is no argument at all, but the point is that, from the commencement of this trouble, and from the very start of the movement in connection with the forming of an association, the burden of the song of the association members has been, 'Give us the right to send our own choice—to elect our own representatives to appear before the Minister and management.' Now, that appears to be reasonable to sensible men. I am twitted with being opposed to that scheme. I am opposed to the scheme of departmental representation, because I believe it is a modified form of sectionalism, but I gave way to defeat straight-out sectionalism. I say that, no matter what the feeling is against me—and I know that feeling does run high, and there is no use denying that there is feeling in the service—when a man gets up and says we are jolly good fellows, and have been doing good work, he is speaking for himself, but the actions of leaders of the movement that we are here to oppose do not demonstrate anything of the kind. Now, if that is the case, that they want the right to elect their own representatives, we have given them that right. It does not matter whether I am defeated or anybody else is defeated. As far as I am concerned, if I can see our ranks solidified to-morrow I can walk out and never go back into office in the society again. I am prompted by a desire to see the ranks as solid as they were in days gone by, and in that condition so essentially necessary to bring about any good, solid, and lasting benefit on behalf of the railwaymen generally. Mr McArley I think, has stated that we have not a rule in our book providing that we are not going to have strikes, or to prevent the possibility of a strike occurring. We have not got such a rule in our book, but I do not think it would be a very difficult matter to get such a rule drawn. However the mere fact of it not being there is attributed to this—that the very idea of striking in the Railway Department is so foreign in every way to the mind of the average railwayman that the thing has never been given a second thought, and the mere reference to the matter here, Mr. Chairman, appears to me to have been made for the purpose of creating an effect. I want to assure this Committee that, so far as we are concerned, not only have we not seriously considered the matter, but the matter has never been referred to, and is not likely to be, either. Now, another gentleman who spoke said that we should be doing better if we devoted our energies in the direction of obtaining members from the ranks of those who were outside the union—the four or five thousand men who were not at present enrolled in any one of these institutions. Now, what are the facts? These figures are approximate. We have in our society at the present day, or at the close of the last quarter, 6,400 members. And what is the total strength of the permanent staff in the Second Division? 6,013, as shown in D.—3; so that we must have an enormous membership in the casual as well as in the permanent staff to have the membership which we have on our books at the present day. Now, Mr McArley made a statement this morning that I very much regretted he did make. I think it would have been far better had he left it alone. He gave as a reason in the memorandum which he read for supporting the petition for recognition of the association that it would give them a freer hand to report breaches of the regulations on the part of members of other departments of the service. Now, those perhaps are not exactly the words he used, but that is the meaning conveyed by his remarks. Now, I want to say this—that if you have a dozen organizations it matters not—a man has his duty to perform, and he invariably does it. The mere fact that a man is a member of a union is not going to prevent that man doing his duty, and I would emphasize this point by saying that, provided Mr McArley takes up that attitude as a reason for withdrawing from the society, if he is looking for them owing to his freedom from them, probably some of them will be looking for him too, and there will be a considerable amount of trouble in this business which is not in the interests of the public, which the Department does not want, and which would not tend towards the welfare of the community at all. Now it was pretty well understood that I was to reply to Mr Milroy, but I have nothing to reply to, because Mr Milroy from the commencement of his address simply gave us praise for what we had done, and really told the truth about the whole situation. A man who has been in the service the length of time he has been knows perfectly well what has been done, and he has been honest and candid enough to come here this morning and admit it, and I am pleased he has done so. I agree absolutely with what he says, that the Amalgamated Society has done good work, and he, with myself and others, is in a position to demonstrate that to you. We know what the conditions are now, and we know the alterations that have been made. Mr Milroy referred to the sectional movement in America, and started off by saying that in a number of the societies in America facilities have been extended to the men on educational lines, and he concludes by giving credit not to the society or the sectional union, but to the officers of the Department. He mentioned that charts and models were

provided for the men, but the Department here has met us in the same direction, and met us very well, in providing facilities for our meetings, and in providing charts and diagrams. The management have treated us very well in the past, and I am also prepared to say that from time to time, as we have gone along and made requests in this particular connection, I believe the General Manager has gone as far as he possibly could. He has not gone as far as we should like him to go, nor as far as he will be prepared to go in time, but does that justify the claim for the existence of a new organization? My contention, Mr Chairman, is this, plainly and simply that to grant the prayer of the petition some reason must be shown for the necessity for a new union. The necessity which has been advanced by the speakers on the other side is that their interests have been neglected. We hear a total absence to-day of the arguments that were brought forward on the occasion of the last meeting. Australia was quoted galore, we had a lot of Australian conditions trotted out against us. They were quoting first grade there as compared with New Zealand, and first grade in other places, but overlooking the fact that there were a very large number of grades. Now, the strength, so far as our system is concerned, lies in this—and, whether this organization is granted recognition or not, these words will prove to be true in the end—that the fewer classes and grades we have in the Railway service, the better it will be for all concerned. I am perfectly convinced of that, and I say that, so far as our scheme of classification is concerned, although it is not perfect, although it is hardly what one would look for as being the correct thing, still I say that the strength of the whole business lies in the fact that we have two grades, and two grades only, in these particular classes. To argue that we are getting sufficient money would be wrong, and I am not prepared to do that, because I am prepared to argue that we are not, but, knowing that we are not, what we have to consider is the best means of going about getting it. I am convinced that a separate organization will not be beneficial to the locomotive-men themselves. It will be diametrically opposed to the other departments of the service, and it will be the forerunner of sectionalism throughout the system. I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that that would be the case, although Mr Russell is optimistic enough to believe that it would not have that effect. I believe from my knowledge of the Railway service—and I say it with an experience extending over twenty-eight years—that so soon as you grant official recognition to this particular organization you will find other claims from other organizations. Whatever I have had to say, I want it to be distinctly understood that it is not of a personal nature. I do not reflect on any one personally, and I have every respect for the opinions that have been expressed, but my sole wish and desire in opposing this proposal for recognition is on account of what I consider the best interests not only of all the members of other departments, but in the interests of the locomotive-men themselves.

MATTHEW JOSEPH MACK further examined. (No. 12.)

1 *Mr Brown.*] I think you said there were 568 members in your society, and the other side said there were 1,110 members in their association?—Seven hundred and sixty-four locomotive-men—not engine-drivers.

2. What is the distinction?—They include drivers, firemen, and cleaners.

3 You said there were very few cleaners?—Yes, in our society

4. If there were only 1,400 altogether, and they have 1,110 in their association, and you have 700, that makes between 1,800 and 1,900?—Yes, but the position is that quite a large number of those men belong to both organizations.

WILLIAM ANDREW VEITCH further examined. (No. 13.)

1 *Mr Russell.*] I think you read a letter dealing with the conditions of the Railway service in New Zealand as far back as 1880?—Yes.

2 And the object of that letter was to show that there were very bad conditions existing in those days?—The date was 1884.

3 Then you wish to correct your evidence in that respect, and say that the letter was dated 1884?—I will get the copy of the letter

4. When was the Amalgamated Society reformed and reconstituted?—I do not know what you mean.

5. When was it officially recognized after the strike in 1890?—In 1894.

6. Then for some years the Amalgamated Society was not recognized by the Government at all?—By the Commissioners.

7 Now, do you not know that in the year 1895 the control of the railways by the Commissioners was absolutely appalling, and a new system was set up under which the control of the railways was taken over by the Government?—Yes, I know that—I have never denied it.

8. Do you not know that the effect of that change—the railways being brought under Ministerial control—brought in the whole of us politicians as battlers for the railwaymen?—No, I did not know anything of the kind.

9. Take, for example, myself—are you not aware that I was the author of the great D.—3 list?—No.

10 Well, I might tell you that I was. Are you not aware that in 1895, when the Bill was going through, there was a large party in the House, consisting of Mr Joyce, all the Christchurch members, and myself, representing the Dunedin workshops at that time, which brought all the pressure we could?—I object to words being put into my mouth.

11 Are you not aware that in 1895 the railways were taken over from the Commissioners and put under the control of the Ministry, and that ever since then railway influence has been exerted through members of Parliament for the benefit of the men?—The interests of the Amalgamated Society have been exerted in that direction, certainly

12 It is no use playing with words. Are you prepared to deny that the members of Parliament have exercised their whole influence for the benefit of the railwaymen in inducing better terms and conditions?—I am prepared to admit that it is my opinion that a great majority of the members of Parliament have done so.

13. Then do you not think that the members of Parliament, working for that purpose, would be likely to have a far greater effect in benefiting the railwaymen than the efforts of the Amalgamated Society?—No, I do not.

14. Now, how many locomotive-men are there in the Wanganui district, where you live?—I do not know

15. Can you tell this Committee how many engine-drivers, firemen, or cleaners there are residing in or about the Wanganui district who are not members of the Engine-drivers' Association?—No, I cannot.

16. Is it a fact that you and one other man represent the whole of the railway servants engaged at Wanganui who are not members of the Engine-drivers' Association?—I cannot answer that question, because I am not a member, and therefore do not know who are members.

*The Chairman* I do not think it is a fair question, because Mr Veitch is here representing the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants; he is not here representing Wanganui or any other part of the country specially

17 *Mr Russell.*] The Locomotive Firemen's Union sent you a letter suggesting federation, did they not—it was read by one of your officers?—Yes.

18. Is it a fact that immediately that letter was received from them you published that letter, with certain comments, in the *Railway Review*?—No, I did not.

19. Well, was it published?—Yes, the letter was published.

20 I will ask you whether you would expect any body of men to continue negotiations when an important letter dealing with a matter of that kind, directly it was written, was at once given publicity to in the *Railway Review*?—Yes, I should, certainly I can see no reasonable objection to the publication of the letter, or I certainly would have objected to it being published. I think it is the duty of our association to give all reasonable information to our members. This was a very hopeful intimation to us, and we were only too glad to give any information to our members. The letter was not marked 'Private' or 'Confidential,' and there was no stipulation that our members were not to know of it. Why should they not know of their own business?

MATTHEW JOSEPH MACK further examined. (No. 14.)

1 *Mr Russell.*] You stated in your evidence that no industrial agreement had ever been made with the Government because the society had never gone before the Court?—That is so.

2 Then I wish to direct your attention to clause 121, and to ask you whether you are aware that under section 3 the Minister is empowered to make an industrial agreement without any reference to the Court at all?—Yes, we are perfectly aware of that, but what is the good of asking the Minister to make an industrial agreement when he is a party to the award and the maximum wage is already being paid.

3 On two occasions in the course of your evidence you used words to the following effect: If the Government break the arrangement that has been made, it will be the duty of the Amalgamated Society to take other steps to protect the interests of its members. What are the other steps to which you refer?—That is our business, not yours. We have a right to take whatever steps we think fit.

4. Do you consider that a strike would be the other steps?—Certainly not.

5 How long is it since you were in the Railway service?—Two years ago on the 8th April of this year

6 What rank did you hold?—A guard.

7 And your salary?—I was receiving 10s. a day when I left, with a telegram announcing promotion to that of a foreman in my hand.

8. Have you any objection to state what salary you receive now?—Yes, I am not going to state what salary I receive now My position in the Railway service was that of a guard with twenty-three years' service, and I resigned on the requisition of the railwaymen signed by all ranks.

9 What did you mean when you said I was indirectly interested in this inquiry?—Well, sir, you have already admitted that you are managing director of the firm that prints the paper That firm gets paid for it, and for four issues of that paper your firm received the sum of £55 8s. 5d.

10. I am not prepared to contest your statement with regard to the price, but do you know how many copies were printed?—No.

11 Do you know that 1,400 copies were printed?—No.

12 Do you know that the paper is sometimes fourteen pages and sometimes sixteen, and that everything except the editorial work is done in my office?—I know your firm is the printer of that paper, and you draw the money for it, therefore I say you are pecuniarily interested, and should not, in my estimation, be advocating the claims of this petition

13 Then, because I, as a member of a printing company receive a job, you say that my mouth should be closed as a member of Parliament?—I say that you stand in the position of an interested party

WILLIAM THOMAS WILSON further examined. (No. 15.)

1 *Mr Russell.*] You said there were 6,400 members in your society, and 6,013 members on the permanent staff?—6,400 members—I said that was approximate.

2. What about the other 387—how do they come into the society?—The number I quoted was the approximate strength of the permanent staff and on the D.-3 list. The others must be made up from the casual staff, but do not appear on the D.-3 list.

3 Are all the men who belong to the casual staff of the Railway workshops and Railway goods-sheds allowed to join the Amalgamated Society?—Yes.

4 And notwithstanding that the total strength of the whole society is only 6,400. Is it not a fact that there are 13,000 men employed in the Railways altogether?—Probably there are if you take the First Division into account, but they have an organization of their own.

5 And including the casuals that joined, the total strength of the Amalgamated Society is only 6,400?—Yes, about that.

6. *Mr Hine* ] You mentioned the First Division: do you say they have a separate representation of their own?—Yes, a separate society of their own—that is, the clerical division.

7 And do they have access to the Ministerial ear?—They have their usual conferences. I do not know what methods they adopt.

8. But they have a separate society?—Yes.

WILLIAM ANDREW VEITCH further examined. (No. 16.)

1 *Mr Kennedy* ] I wish to ask you, Mr Veitch, whether the last Conference of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants did not consider a proposal to give the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association direct representation, and, if so, what was the result so far as the Conference was concerned?—The Conference considered the question from three points, and after fully discussing the matter decided on a certain course. But first of all I must say that they did not discuss the question of giving the locomotive-men direct representation. The question was whether four branches would be given direct representation—that is, the locomotive-running, workshops, maintenance-men, and traffic-men—whether each of those sections should have equal and direct representation. Then we arranged that we would alter the rules to give equal representation to each of the departments, but that the members would be elected from the whole service—that is, by all the members of the service. The idea of that was to give each man access to every member of the society. Since that ballot has been taken—

2 I asked you whether it was discussed, and what was the result of that discussion—did they grant it or did they refuse it?—I must qualify it. I am not going to allow any man to put words into my mouth. The explanation I have given is the position. The matter was discussed, and the decision arrived at by the Conference is that which I have just explained to the Committee.

3. I should like you to let us know a little more about that letter you have put in as evidence. You said it was written in 1880 in Christchurch, and later on you said it was written in 1884. I have been in Christchurch all my life, and I should like you to let me know who wrote the letter and who signed it?—The letter was sent in. I was not in the service at the time, but the fact is that the letter was sent in, but I do not know who signed it. Any one who wants to see it can do so at the head office of the A.S.R.S.

4. Do you think, as a railway unionist, you have the confidence of the amalgamated men in the district you reside in?—Now, Mr Chairman, I am asked to be a thought-reader. I do not know.

5. *Mr McArley* ] You said you pressed the engine-drivers and firemen's grievances with force: will you state to the Committee what force you used to press those grievances any more than the association could use?—What I meant to say is this—that the Amalgamated Society, being a large body and having great influence, could certainly carry greater influence than a few men bickering amongst themselves. First of all, the society would represent all branches of the service, and when we went forward with any request it would be recognized as coming from the whole of the Railway service, with the influence, and consent, and numerical weight of those men behind them. If any one section of the service came along with one demand to the General Manager he would have to consider the aspect—he would have to say 'Well, if I give it to these men am I going to do an injustice to the other men?' and then he would have to consider the other unions before he considered the matter placed before him by this one section.

6. Why did you say at the last meeting before this Committee that you had no power to force grievances to be remedied?—We do not have any power to force. Any sensible man knows that. The General Manager is still in charge of the Railway Department—we are not. I only wish we were for a day or two. What is the good of my coming along here and saying that we will insist on certain things being done, when the General Manager is in charge of the Department?

7 At the last meeting before this Committee you said that the Amalgamated Society had grievances?—Yes.

8 Why have you not rectified them?—Because I am not General Manager.

9 You said you had power. What power have you got, either political or industrial?—I have already explained, and I cannot see that I can give any more information on the subject. All through the last two years, since we have been conducting this society, we have been doing our best for the locomotive-men. Mr Ronayne will admit that, and also that we have done our very best to get the grievances of the railwaymen redressed.

10. You practically admit in your statement that you can do no more than the Engine-drivers' Association can do?—No, I do not.

11 *Mr Milroy* ] I think you said that before recognition could be granted it would be only fair to put the question to the vote of the whole of the members. Is that what you mean? Do you mean that there should be a vote taken on the question, and that the members of the society should be consulted?—I was explaining to the Committee that in my opinion you must have either one system or the other—you must either have the sectional system or the amalgamation system. Then I explained that in my opinion the natural effect of splitting up the Railway service into sections would be to detrimentally affect the interests of the whole service, and I felt it was only fair that,

until the whole service was proved to be in favour of this new system being adopted, no new system should be adopted. I say that the fate of the whole of the railwaymen depends on the report of this Committee.

12. Supposing we came to a decision of that kind, do you think it would be fair that each man throughout the service should have a say on this question?—Yes.

13. *Mr McArley* ] Are you aware that in Western Australia, and also in South Australia, for some considerable time there has been in existence a Locomotive-engine Drivers' Association and an Amalgamated Society?—I do not know all the facts about those States, and, as a matter of fact, those questions are only another attempt to put words into my mouth.

MATTHEW JOSEPH MACK further examined. (No. 17)

1. *Mr Kennedy* ] Is it not a fact that the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants has been spurred to action and has increased its membership during the last two years, and that that is chiefly owing to the fact that the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association has been formed?—Yes. I am quite prepared to admit this that the Amalgamated Society has been spurred to action during the last two years, and that action has been taken by myself I was elected to the office by an overwhelming majority, and directly I took office the society began to go forward.

2. *Mr McLaren*.] I understood you to say that your society had a distinct agreement with the Government that it would not affiliate with outside bodies?—Yes, that is one of the terms of recognition.

3. Has that been adhered to faithfully throughout?—Right up to the present time. I will read the terms of recognition if required.

4. Have you ever been approached by outside labour bodies?—Yes. They have not actually approached us to affiliate, but from time to time we have had representatives of labour bodies coming to us and saying that we ought to affiliate and get closer to organized labour, but we have fully adhered to the terms of recognition.

5. Have you knowledge of any class of transport work? The seamanship of this country, in regard to dealings with transport work, is controlled by one union?—Yes, that is so.

6. I want to know is it within your knowledge that the matters in dispute between the ship-owners of the country and the Seamen's Union were settled in conference with the Minister of Marine as Chairman of the Conference?—I cannot exactly say that it is within my knowledge.

SAMUEL KENNEDY further examined. (No. 18.)

*The Chairman* Do you wish to reply on behalf of the Locomotive-engine Drivers' Association?

*Witness* Yes. Mr Chairman and gentlemen,—Of course, fifteen minutes is a very short time within which to reply to the large amount of new ground which has been opened up. You have heard from the Amalgamated Society's delegates the proposition they have put forward, whereby they have made arrangements so that the engine-drivers and firemen should be taken into their society. This is the first we have heard about it in an official way, and I do not think it would be fair to ask me to reply to it now, especially in the limited time allowed. There is one matter I should like to mention in regard to a question asked by Mr McLaren with reference to the seamen having but one union. I was rather surprised to hear that, because I think that of all callings in the world seamanship has the most trades-unions. If you take the shipping in New Zealand and look through how many trades-unions the New Zealand Shipping Company have to deal with, you will find they have to deal with more than the Minister of Railways. You have not only the sailors, but you have the cooks and engineers, &c. I am not in a position to say how many unions the manager of the New Zealand Shipping Company has to deal with, but there is a large number, and that is where we claim we can quote a comparison in support of our case. With regard to the move of the Amalgamated Society for direct representation, the society claims a membership of 6,400, and they consider that because 3,107 voted, therefore it has been carried. There are 3,293 members of the society who have not voted at all, or whose votes have not been recorded, and yet the engine-drivers, firemen, and cleaners who belong to our association are to be coerced into it because 3,107 members of the Amalgamated Society say we are to come in. I say that is not a fair proposition, and it is not one that the Amalgamated Society should expect us to seriously entertain for one moment. Mr Veitch put in a letter that was written by somebody in Christchurch away back in 1880. I thought first he got it out of the Museum, but it appears it has been stored up in the records of the Amalgamated Society as a curiosity. The Amalgamated Society we say was a good society when it started, but it did not start till ten years after that letter was written. The best work it ever did was when the membership was 1,000 strong and no more. It was a small society when it got from a Conservative Government the greatest concession that New Zealand railwaymen ever got, and that was the fifty-four-hour week—nine hours a day—in 1890. Now, we are 1,000 strong and more, and I say the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants has never achieved such a forward move as on that occasion. It certainly was a good society, and for many years it did a great deal of good. There is no reason why it should not do good now but we say that for our purpose it is useless. We helped that society along, and we have taken a very active part in it for many years, but it is a well-known fact amongst leaders of trades-unions that members of an amalgamated society drawing the higher pay can be of great assistance in lifting the lower-paid men up, but when it comes to getting higher pay for themselves they are in the minority. That is the reason that, after the drivers, and firemen, and cleaners have assisted this Amalgamated Society and been loyal to it for over twenty years, they find themselves as regards pay in a worse



condition than they were before the society started at all. That is a fact. In 1885 the engine-driver's maximum pay was 13s., and in 1910 the maximum pay is 12s. 6d. In 1905 the minimum pay of a Stationmaster was £155 a year, including a house, and in 1910 it is £190—2s. 3d. per day of a rise, and the engine-driver has gone back 6d. Is it any wonder that we are not satisfied with the Amalgamated Society? Is it any wonder that after a time we started a union of our own in order to do our own business with the management and Parliament? I think it is not. Now, our opponents like to bring up the Australian conditions. We have brought up nothing to-day about the Australian conditions—absolutely nothing. First, I wish to say that when one commences to speak about conditions it is the most misleading thing possible. The Minister of Railways in the House the other day inferred that the conditions in Australia were not as good as here, because he said that in a special State if a driver was away from his home in that State for twelve hours he got 1s., and here we give our drivers 5s. if they are away one night. I do not think I have drawn one night's lodging-money for two years, and I do not want to do so, but if I had drawn 1s. for every time I was away for twelve hours I should have drawn a good many pounds. I do not say that the conditions are better than here, but I do not believe in saying that they are worse. Men are not very often away at night, and we do not wish to be. When a man talks about conditions it is most misleading, and he is apt to be led right away from the issue at stake. A great many people have asked us why we have left the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, and I think you gentlemen ought to have a pretty good idea why. The best argument I can give is this—it is an old Scotch proverb "The proof of the pudding is in the eating." The locomotive-men have remained members of the Amalgamated Society until two years ago, and they partook of that pudding, and after twenty years of it they made another pudding called the Locomotive-engine Drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association. That pudding is to their relish now, and it rests with you gentlemen to say whether they are going to be allowed to partake of the pudding that is to their liking or be forced to partake of the one they do not relish. You will give us credit for being an intelligent body of men. Our men are thoroughly in earnest, and there is one thing we want to impress upon your minds, and that is, there is absolutely no possibility of the engine-drivers and firemen going back to the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. They do not intend to go back after their representation—I was going to say "dodges," but I will not. I should not dare to go back to my fellow-workers if I entertained such a proposal. We are prepared to remain in our society even if it is not recognized at all. I should like to say a word or two about the number of engine-drivers in the Amalgamated Society. They claim 764, but we know perfectly well that is not correct, and I will tell you one reason why they show so many. I myself sent in my resignation last year when the delegates were to be voted for, and at the last February Conference I received a voting-paper to vote, being proof positive that my resignation had not been recorded on their books. That was done all round. We found that to be a common thing in Dunedin a few days ago. One man received a notice from the secretary pointing out that his contributions were very much behind, and asking him to pay up, and yet that man's resignation had been sent in with a lot of others seven months before. In Oamaru a number sent in their resignations a short time ago, and when the vote was being taken as to the direct-representation scheme they all received voting-papers, whereas if all the resignations had been duly recorded they would not have received the voting-papers. Sometimes resignations are sent back with a request for reconsideration, and if the Amalgamated Society continue to adopt the tactics they are adopting now you will find the locomotive-men on the books till the end of the chapter. We maintain that the position of the engine-driver to-day proves not that the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants will not take up our grievances and put them before the Minister—we do not charge them with that—but we say that the society has grown to be such a cumbersome institution that it is incapable of putting the engine-driver in his proper position with regard to pay and other conditions. The Amalgamated Society has all along strenuously maintained, when opposing us, that our conditions were as good as in Australia, but when the Minister of Railways went over there and pointed out certain things, we had ample proof of our argument being correct. Seeing that the only test that the president of the Amalgamated Society could put forward twelve months ago, that we should hold together for twelve months and maintain a membership of 1,000 members—seeing that we have passed that, it is proof that we are in earnest, and that we have men amongst us capable of managing our business and putting our case before the management in order that the members themselves will be able to derive the full benefit of the labour legislation of this country. I think it is only right and just that you as a Committee should recommend that the Minister should recognize our association. It is a most remarkable thing that a union which has been registered for two years in a country like this, where a body of men according to the law can form a union, and once it is formed they can compel their employer to recognize it—that in a country like New Zealand, with a thousand members in a union which has been registered for two years—a union consisting of men doing the most important work—namely, the control of the motive power of our railways—is not recognized by the Minister. Now, before I conclude I should like to say that there is only one way of settling the trouble amongst the railwaymen. There is no gainsaying that there has been feeling in the matter, and very bitter feeling, which will continue while the Amalgamated Society desires to oppose our recognition. There is no other union in New Zealand that would attempt to prevent the Minister recognizing us. Several have wished us good luck since we came to Wellington, and they say we certainly ought to be recognized. Now, gentlemen, when considering this matter I wish you to remember that refusal of our recognition means that the Amalgamated Society will get their way. It means the destruction of another union, and it means that the drivers and firemen are going to suffer by such refusal. Now, our union has a great deal higher percentage of members represented by its delegates than is the case with the representatives of the Amalgamated Society, and it would be a crying shame to break up our union. This

union has been started for the benefit of the men in various ways. It has a sick benefit fund to which members contribute, and from which they are entitled to payments per week if away sick. We have also arranged for doctors, and in this way we have been doing a great deal of good. If you are going to let the Amalgamated Society have its way you are going to undo the good work of our association. I want to say that personally I have no ill feeling against the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, and I am quite sure that our union is against any harm coming to that society, and if they found themselves in any trouble we would not be above putting our hands in our pockets to assist them if necessary, but I hope they will never require that. I look forward to the day when we shall be federated with the Amalgamated Society, and work shoulder to shoulder as brothers for the common good of all. There are many noble men in the Amalgamated Society, and we admire many of their actions, and there is nothing further from our wishes than to have to point out their shortcomings. I am certain that if the prayer of our petition is granted, at the end of twelve months all ill feeling will have absolutely subsided, and there will be no bickering or ill feeling on the part of the Amalgamated Society with the Engine-drivers and Firemen's Association. I am sure we shall welcome the day when we can look to the members of the Amalgamated Society as comrades. I will now conclude my remarks by thanking you for the kind and patient hearing you have given me.

WILLIAM ANDREW VEITCH further examined. (No. 19.)

*The Chairman* The Committee will now hear what you have to say in reply, Mr Veitch.

*Witness* In his opening remarks Mr Kennedy said that the Locomotive-engine Drivers' Association had not received any official intimation in regard to direct representation in our society. I cannot understand that, there must be a mistake somewhere. As you are aware, they started their correspondence by suggesting a conference with us. After that had gone on for a little while they withdrew their offer and cancelled all negotiations, and we felt that we were not justified in writing to them direct under the circumstances, as it would hardly be dignified, but we took the course that we thought would meet with the wishes of everybody and at the same time maintain the dignity of our own society. For that reason we asked the Premier to offer that to these men, and if his communication has not reached them I am sure it will reach them shortly. This is the letter we wrote to Sir Joseph Ward: 'Wellington, 4th August, 1910.—SIR,—You are hereby authorized by the executive council to convey to the Engine-drivers, Firemen, and Cleaners' Association, through the Minister of Railways, the fact that our society has altered its constitution so as to give equal and direct representation to the four branches of the service, and that the council are also prepared to resign and take a fresh election, so as to give those men an opportunity of electing their own choice to represent them.' The Premier's reply to that, dated the 2nd September, 1910, is as follows: "DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of your letter of the 6th August, in which you inform me that the executive council of your association purposes holding a special Conference in February next in order to give effect to direct departmental representation. In reply I have to inform you that the representations which you have made on the subject are noted, and I thank you for communicating the same to me." That is the position so far as that matter is concerned, and we thought that was the proper course for us to adopt in the circumstances. Now, a good deal of capital has been made out of the fact that the executive at the last Conference did not desire to give direct representation in the fullest sense, but it is a remarkable fact that about eight months before that Conference took place the association had a Conference, at which it was decided they should write to us and enter into negotiations with regard to a scheme of federation. Although that was carried some considerable time before our Conference took place, it was not communicated to us till just lately. Now, I cannot understand why that letter was not sent to us before our Conference met, because if it had been the Conference would have known the wishes of the locomotive-men and would probably have complied with them. But in order to get over the difficulty, and in order to do everything we possibly could to settle this difficulty—for after all, there is only one way to settle it, and that is to compromise—we have now taken a ballot of our members, and it was carried by a large majority, while the Labour Department has altered our rules in conformity with the decision of members as expressed by the ballot, and those rules are now in operation. However, we felt that, as we were entitled to hold office till February, 1912 to alter the rules now, and put a new system into operation in 1912, would be almost insincerity. We considered that, as direct representation had been carried by a large majority we should all resign office to put the system into operation as early as possible. The Conference will be held in February next, and an election will take place before very long. We did not push it too fast, because we felt that it would appear to be insincere if we did not allow the locomotive-men to consider the position, and give an opportunity to those who had resigned to rejoin under the new system. For that reason we allowed three months to elapse, in order to make up the electoral roll under the new system. I think you will agree that we can do nothing more, and that we have met them in every possible way. The last Conference altered our rules very considerably in the direction of giving representation, and immediately after we received the letter from Mr McArley we arranged to have a ballot taken, and in order to prove our sincerity we are resigning our offices and will face election again. Now, if there is anything more that can be done without breaking up our society we are only too willing to do it. We have only one object in view and that is to keep our men together. Mr. Russell spoke somewhat disparagingly in regard to federation of labour, which he said had been brought about for the purpose of working off a big strike. At least, he did not speak in favour of that federation of labour, while he speaks in favour of the federation of this proposed union and our society. Now, federation is either right or wrong in principle, and the principle cannot be right in one case and wrong in another. Why does he favour the principle in one case and not in another? Now, Mr Kennedy has stated that, notwithstanding all that has

happened, notwithstanding the fact that the Amalgamated Society has altered its constitution for the purpose of endeavouring to bring about a compromise with them, the engine-drivers will never come back to the Amalgamated Society. That is a very definite statement. Now, there are not many engine-drivers who will require to come back to the Amalgamated Society. The number of engine-drivers on the Classification List is 497, and the number in our society is 354, so that there would not be a great number to come back if they all came back. I wish to refer to a statement made by Mr. Kennedy to the Railways Committee last year, when he said that 166 resignations had been sent in to the Canterbury Branch of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. That is on record in the report of the Committee on that occasion. We have made inquiries from the secretary of the Canterbury branch of our society, and he says that at the time that statement was made twenty-five locomotive-men had sent in their resignations, but a few were still financial on the books. I am convinced that it would be only the leaders of the association who would refuse to return to the fold, and that if these men persist in the agitation they have taken up, while we have done all the backing-down, the rank and file of the Locomotive Department will not follow them. I contend that we have been reasonable in this case in dealing with these men. Above all things I do hope we shall come to a settlement of the difficulty. This fighting and bickering is injurious to ourselves and injurious to the whole of the public service, and I am sure members of Parliament do not care about it. It is not right that this matter should have been forced upon the Railways Committee again this year, and I should have much preferred some other way of settling it. When I said that this association should be required to maintain a membership of 1,000 members for twelve months before the matter was decided, it was done with the object of seeing whether the men were sincere, or whether it was only a spasm of unpopular feeling which had created the dissatisfaction. That statement was made on the assumption that the Railways Committee would finally settle the matter then. However, the Committee reported to the House, and the House decided to allow the matter to stand in abeyance for a year, and the result is that everything has stood where it was from last year until now. If the association is going to be recognized, those who are now in the A.S.R.S. will be driven out of it, but, if not, then the great majority of those members who have gone out of the society will realize the position, and come back to the Amalgamated Society. When you realize the position, that Parliament shelved the question, and it was agreed that the matter should stand over till this session, it is natural that the men would hang on awaiting the decision of Parliament. When I made that statement I assumed that the matter would be definitely settled by the Railways Committee, and if it had been finally settled at that time we should not have been here battling to-day with the association, but should perhaps have been able to bring before you some grievances in order to urge you to do something for the locomotive-men. After all, it is not a question of what has been accomplished by the Amalgamated Society or what has happened in other countries. The whole question, boiled down to two points, is, have the Amalgamated Society done its duty to the locomotive-men, and, if not, can they do better by separating from the society. It is for these men to prove that the Amalgamated Society has not done its duty to them, and I think you will agree that they have failed to prove that. It is also for them to prove that a new association could do better than the one they have got, and I think they should be asked to prove that their action in withdrawing from our society would not detrimentally affect the whole of the railwaymen. I think the case we have put justifies the Committee in coming to the conclusion that the Amalgamated Society has done its duty, and that the locomotive-men can do no better by breaking away, and forming a new union, and injuring the whole of the members in the Railway service, and that no such change should be brought about which would so vitally affect their interest. With regard to Mr. Kennedy's remarks concerning those who did not vote in the ballot, it is a recognized principle that silence gives consent, and those who did not vote were not opposed to direct representation. One of the terms of recognition is that the men are at liberty to come and go when they like, and the locomotive-men have not gone out in a body, as has been represented to you by these men. Now, Mr. Kennedy made a statement to the effect that the locomotive-men were worse off in New Zealand to-day than they were twenty years ago.

*Mr. Kennedy* I did not make that statement.

*Witness* That is what I understood; and you said that engine-drivers then got 13s. a day, whereas they now get 12s. 6d. In those days there were very few drivers who got 13s. a day. The hours then were very long, and it is owing to the Amalgamated Society that that improvement has been brought about. A great deal remains to be done, but it is hardly fair to say that nothing has been done. The work is not completed, and until the work of the Amalgamated Society is completed we cannot be blamed for what has not been accomplished. We are pushing on, and if we could only get the men to pull together and be loyal we could push on and make further progress. With regard to the pudding, well, I think the proof of the pudding is the digesting of it. Our pudding is delicious to eat and not indigestible. They want a pudding which is delicious to eat for the present time, but when they come to digest it they will wish they had taken the advice of Dr. Keitch, and stuck to the wholesome pudding on which they have fattened so long. With regard to a sick benefit fund, we have that provision in our society, and are just about getting it going now, and any member who has joined our society is eligible to join the Sick Benefit Fund. I do not think I need go any further in replying to what Mr. Kennedy has said, but I say that this matter is of the utmost importance to the railwaymen of New Zealand. However, I should like to repeat what I previously said, that I do not think these men have evil intentions. They say they are taking this move with good intentions, and I believe them; but, whatever their intentions may be, they are going to break up our society and injure our men. We want to avoid that, and work in harmony. We have done our best to meet them, and altered our constitution and our rules, and now stand in the position that our resignation will take effect the moment the election takes place. If we have the honour and privilege of being re-elected, I sincerely hope that we shall have some of those locomotive-men at our Conference, and then they will be able to judge whether the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants has done any good for railwaymen.

MATTHEW JOSEPH MACK further examined. (No. 20.)

*The Chairman* Mr Kennedy has said that your figures as to the number of engine-drivers on the roll of your society are not correct, and you have said that the number is correct. Can you give any evidence to the Committee to prove that what you say is correct?

*Witness* I am prepared to submit to you the names, the years' services, and the grades of the men at this present moment, but I am not prepared to submit the names of the men who are remaining in our society, for the benefit of those who are opposing us. Mr Kennedy has probably been misled or deceived. I have in my hand a list of the resignations which was formerly drawn up by the secretary of the Wellington branch here, and a man was appointed to canvass the men to get them to resign. As a matter of fact, two of the signatures on it are not of members of the society at all, and five of those who originally signed it came and asked to have their names scratched off. I am not prepared to put in a list of the members who belong to our society, because some of the members will be twitted with belonging to the society when they are supposed to have resigned. Mr Kennedy mentioned the fact of his receiving a voting-paper, and that his name has been taken into account in the membership. I am sure that his name has not been taken into account, and I have a list here in which his name is not shown at all in connection with direct representation.

SAMUEL KENNEDY further examined. (No. 21)

*Mr McLaren* You said that the most liberal concession the railwaymen had ever got was from the Government of New Zealand, but it was not clear to me what Government it was you referred to. What Government was in power at the time this concession of nine hours per day was granted?

*Witness:* The Government that was in power at the time the nine-hours-a-day concession was granted to the Amalgamated Society was a Conservative Government—it was about 1890—in Sir Harry Atkinson's time, I think.

MATTHEW JOSEPH MACK further examined. (No. 22)

1 *Mr. Arnold.*] I can quite understand that both statements may be correct in regard to the membership of the societies, but are the members you mention financial members, or are those the names that are on the roll?—There are always a number of unfinancial members, which you will get in any society. Those are simply the members whose names are on our books. There was retrenchment in our department last year, and the movement of the engine-drivers is supposed to have caused a lot to go out of our society, but our membership is only thirty-eight below what it was before. If there is anything this Committee wants in the way of proof of what any member of our side has said, I am prepared to submit proof without comment. I do not get a statement as to whether the members are financial or not, only a statement of the members of the whole association; but information as to the number of members unfinancial would be in the possession of each branch.

2. *Mr Russell* (to Mr Veitch).] Is it a uniform subscription to the Amalgamated Society, and how much per week?—Threepence per week.

3. For every member?—No, some are members of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, and they contribute 5s. a year

4. The balance-sheet would show what has been received from the members of your society?—Yes.

5. And it is a uniform subscription of 3d. per week?—Yes.

6. But all the members do not pay 3d.?—There are a few who do not.

---

FRIDAY, 16TH SEPTEMBER, 1910.

(No. 23.)

*Mr McLaren, M.P.* Mr Chairman and gentlemen,—I do not intend to occupy the time of the Committee at any great length, because I think it is unnecessary, but from my association with industrial unions of workers for over twelve years I have an intimate knowledge of the trend of industrial or trades unionism throughout the country, and how it is affecting industrial conditions. I desire to make a statement with regard to the general trend of industrial organization in the country, and also especially with regard to industrial organization affecting the branches of transport work other than the Railway service. I think that may throw some light on the problem that the Committee has to deal with. The whole tendency during the last five or six years amongst unions of workers in this country has been towards closer federation and amalgamation in the direction of the one organization governing in the one industry. This has not in all instances taken the form of complete amalgamation. In some instances it has taken the form of association for mutual protection and benefit. For instance, in connection with the building trade there are a number of separate unions, such as the carpenters, painters, plumbers, and building trades' labourers. Those bodies have found that on occasions they came in conflict with one another, and there has been a movement towards having a separate executive of advice, so as to arrive at something like recognition of common principles in the administration of the matters that the industry has to deal with. I may say that in forming the Building Trades' Council these several unions are following the line that has already been taken by similar organizations in

Australia. When I returned from Australia some eighteen months ago I brought with me a copy of the constitution which they were working under on the other side. The desirability of dealing with our industries on the line of solidarity has already been recognized by the Legislature in that there is a section of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act which seeks to prevent multiplicity of unions, and there has also been an amendment of the Act to increase the number required to form a union, with the same object of preventing too many small bodies. My experience is that where there is one organization governing a distinct industry or service, and a move is made by any section to separate from the permanent body, the tendency is for that movement to spread, and general disintegration may take place unless the subdividing process is checked in time. For instance, with regard to the seamen, firemen, and trimmers of this country, the vast majority of the workers in that industry are in the one amalgamated union named the Australasian Federated Seamen's Union, New Zealand Branch. The New Zealand Branch is a distinct organization covering New Zealand. Through conflict between or with certain officers of that organization there was some years back a split which created two Seamen's Unions, both of which were registered, and later on there was a move made towards creating another union out of the permanent body—a union of firemen and trimmers. The great body of the men have shown that they consider this process of dividing detrimental to their interests in that the move for a separate Firemen and Trimmers' Union was done away with, and now the Australian Federated Seamen's Union practically controls the whole industry so far as seamanship is concerned. At the time that the Australian Federated Seamen's Union got their last award it was secured in this way. There was some fear that a conflict might become so acute between the shipowners and the two seamen's unions that a strike would result, and the services of the Minister of Labour, the Hon J. A. Millar, were called in as Chairman of the Conference, by which means one agreement for the whole service was effected. Where there are several unions connected with one industry or service, each has a right to have its affairs settled by means of a separate agreement or award, as the case may be, and in some industries this is found to be hampering and mischievous because of these agreements coming in conflict somewhat with one another. I hear continual complaints from employers in a large way, such as the head of the Union Steamship Company, the New Zealand Shipping Company, and such public officials as our City Engineer, owing to their having to deal with so many different agreements or awards in connection with the one industry. In connection with one branch of transport work with which I am particularly well acquainted—I refer to the waterside work—I find the position of organization in that industry to be that over in Australia at the same port they will have more than one union. For instance, at the Port of Melbourne they have the Stevedores' Union, covering the men working in foreign-going vessels, and then they have another union called the Melbourne Wharf Labourers' Union, covering the men who are working the coastal boats. The existence of the two unions has been a continual source of trouble both to the shipowners and to the workers themselves. The difference between the industrial award under which one union was working, and the industrial award of the other, created such friction that a strike resulted owing to the dissatisfaction with the different rates that were being paid in this one industry. At Sydney they also have two unions, the Sydney Coal-lumpers' Union and the Sydney Wharf Labourers' Union. I visited that port, and made inquiries from the officers and executive of both unions, and both sides were agreed that the existence of the two bodies was a source of continual trouble. They regretted that in times past the step had been taken to form separate unions, as it now threw upon them a great burden to bring unity out of the disunity that had resulted on a previous occasion. I may say that the business secretary of the Wharf Labourers' Union here, Mr. T. Smith, had a visit just last week from a leading member of the staff of the Coal-lumpers' Union, who informed him that the existence of the separate bodies had been found so unsatisfactory that a strong move was now being made to solidify and bind them into one organization. Here in Wellington I was business secretary of the Wharf Labourers' Union for ten years, and some five years ago our executive had to meet an agitation that arose over the creation of separate bodies that had formed. First the coal-lumpers said, 'Oh! what is the use of us belonging to this union? At the meeting we are talked down by the men belonging to the other branches.' They then wanted a separate union. The coal-lumpers had not been agitating long in that way when the men in the deep-sea boats said that they also would form a separate union. We saw that if this movement went on there would have been five separate unions in the port. The five unions that would probably have resulted would have been the Stevedores' Union, General Cargo-workers, Harbour Board Workers, Coal-lumpers, and Slip and Dock Workers. It is remarkable, Mr. Chairman, that the number of branches or sections connected with the waterside work of this port is just the same as the number of branches that would exist in the Railway service of this country. To meet this position of disaffection in the Wharf Union here, the executive made a recommendation to amend the rules to provide for different sections or branches of their industry controlling their own affairs, whilst at the same time preserving the unity of the organization. I have the rules here, and the sections were classified thus: "(1) Stevedores' Section No. 1—To comprise all those whose usual occupation is the working of cargo on Home-going or foreign vessels. (2.) Stevedores' Section No. 2—To comprise all those whose usual occupation is the working of cargo on board the coastal and intercolonial trading vessels. For the time being this section to include all those engaged on ship-work. (3.) Harbour Board Section—To comprise all those employed as wharf labourers by the Wellington Harbour Board. 4.) Coal-lumpers' Section—To comprise all workers engaged as wharf labourers in handling coal on ships or wharves." Since then the slip workers have been made a separate section. "Rule 7 (a.) *Union*.—Subject to the control of the union in ordinary, general, or special meetings, the union shall be governed by an executive council, consisting of a president, vice-president, treasurer, and secretary, together with the delegates of sections. (b.) *Sections*.—Subject to the control of the union and section concerned, each section shall be represented by five

delegates. As far as practicable, the men employed by each company to be represented by a delegate. That was the principle of direct representation on the council of management, and that is one union.

1 *Mr Russell.*] But federation within the union?—No, it is one union. It is a classification of members really within the one union, not federation. A federation means an association of unions.

2. Will you kindly explain what the functions of each section are as far as management is concerned?—In Rule 9 this provision was made ‘Each section of workers shall have power of supervision over all matters directly affecting their own class of work, provided that no decisions arrived at by any section shall be acted upon unless approved of by the executive council. As soon after each meeting of a section as possible, the delegates of each section shall report in writing to the general secretary on the business of such meeting, and the secretary shall present such report to the next succeeding meeting of the executive council.’ Chief delegates: A delegate shall act as chairman at all meetings of a section or committee of a section, and in the absence of a delegate the meeting shall choose its own chairman.’ That means that, on matter arising that directly affects the one class of work, such as coal-work, the men engaged in that work meet together and discuss the matter, with which they, of course, are most conversant, and come to a decision, and make a recommendation to the council of management of the union. The unity of the organization is thereby preserved, and at the same time full power of direct representation, and, in a sense, direct control, is preserved within the organization itself. I do not think, Mr Chairman, that if I spoke for a week I could alter the position. I think members are pretty well seised of the position, and I will not waste your time any further, but I simply wish to say that from a long experience with regard to industrial organizations I am satisfied that there is a danger to the public service of the Dominion if there is recognition of various bodies within one service, because with the existence of separate officials my experience has been that friction arises which cannot be prevented and is not always foreseen.

3. I should like to know whether the Australian Federation, of which the Seamen’s Union is a branch, would have power under its constitution to call out the seamen upon our coast who belong to our union?—No. That is not the mode of procedure under the constitution. There would have to be the consent of the New Zealand Union. Might I explain this: that there is distinct registration. Although there is one federation for Australasia, there is yet a separate federation in Australia to that in New Zealand, because the Acts under which they are registered are different.

4. You emphasized the building trade and its diverse sections. Do you think it would be practicable to have one Building Trades’ Union for the whole of New Zealand?—No, not at the present time.

5. Now, with regard to the men who are on the Government steamers, the “Hinemoa” and “Tutanekai,” do they belong to the Federated Seamen’s Union?—Well, I would not be sure—I would not like to say.

6. You do not know?—No.

7. Is it not a fact, with regard to the whole industry that you represent—you are largely interested in the waterside workers?—Yes.

8. Is it not a fact that, speaking of the seamen generally, the engineers always have a separate branch from the other portions of the marine service—they have their own union, and represent their interests directly to the authorities that control them?—Yes, because they are regarded as a profession, whereas the other branch is regarded as tradesmen.

9. Do you consider that the men who are on the footplate, the trained engine-drivers, and the firemen who are themselves working up to be engine-drivers, are out of place or acting improperly when they ask that they should have a separate union for the purpose of making direct representation to the Government regarding their branch of the service?—I would not say that they are out of place in doing it—that is their business, but I certainly consider that they are acting unwisely and against their own interests.

10. With regard to the very interesting explanation you have given regarding the experience of the Wharf Labourers’ Union, you say that they felt compelled to divide up in order to maintain their union?—No.

11. Then why did they divide up into four sections?—The move to divide up into separate unions was because they considered they were not getting a direct hearing for matters affecting their own special work. That was provided for.

12. And in order to prevent the break-up of the union into five unions they adopted the sectional system, with a joint council to manage the whole: is not that so?—They adopted, properly speaking, a direct representation—a sectional control within their own organization, the one union.

13. You used the words “Section 1”?—Yes.

14. Showing that the union had been divided into sections?—I want it to be clearly understood that the union is not divided into sections as if each section was a different body from the others. The word “section” is used as distinguishing a branch of work.

15. And the object was to prevent the breaking-up of the union?—Yes.

16. I gathered from what you said that the different portions concluded that they were not getting adequate treatment by the whole. Now, is not that exactly the same position as the locomotive-engine drivers are taking up regarding the Amalgamated Society?—No.

17. Will you tell me in what respect it differs?—It differs in this respect: that when the provision was made for direct representation of each branch of workers on the council of management, they then ceased any agitation for a separate organization. Any man who raised a cry on that wharf now for a separate union simply would not get a hearing.

18. You are aware that when the engine-drivers' agitation first started there was no such question raised as direct representation on the executive of the Amalgamated Society?—Yes. I am aware that the alteration that has since been made in their rules providing for direct representation was not mooted when the move was first made for separate recognition of the locomotive-men.

19. In fact, it has only come into existence since last session, and then at the suggestion of this Committee: is not that so?—Well, I am prepared to give the Committee that credit. I might say that personally I met the representatives of both sides, and urged them strongly that they should settle their differences, and the engine-drivers' society representatives told me that if the provision in the rules for direct representation had been made some time previously they would probably have fallen in with it. I urged them that it was surely reasonable that when the right course was taken, even if it was late, they should fall in with it.

20. Of course, it is not altogether surprising that a lot of bad blood has been created on both sides, and that the locomotive people now prefer to try and paddle their own canoe. Now, with regard to the illustration that you gave of the Wellington Wharf Labourers' Union, with its four sections, I think that is a local union existing only in Wellington, is it not?—Yes, that is so.

21. Now, supposing that union was a union dealing with the whole of New Zealand, would you consider it practicable to follow out that sectional system with a joint executive, the same as it is when it is a local union only?—Well, if the industry was purely of a national character, then I should. As one who took a leading part in organizing both the Wharf Labourers' Union and the New Zealand Waterside Workers' Federation, I should have moved for creating the one New Zealand union. Had there been one New Zealand Waterside Workers' Union formed it would have been regarded as detrimental to the interests of the workers to split up their organization if it had once been formed.

22. I should like you to clear up a question raised by myself at the last meeting about the 'no-strike' clause. I think you have been one of the leaders of the Federation of Labour?—That is so.

23. Would you consider there would be a greater possibility of securing a strike on the railways under an Amalgamated Union than there would be if the locomotive-engine drivers had a separate union?—My knowledge of the industrial conditions here and elsewhere teaches me this: that there is a greater impulse towards strikes where there is any element of division and friction. As proof that this is sound, I would point to the fact that the Trades' Union Congress just sitting in Britain at the present time has by an enormous majority carried resolutions for amalgamation of organizations within the one industry, for the purpose of preserving discipline and preventing unnecessary conflict.

24. Would you consider it would be a bad thing for the people of New Zealand that there should be recognition of the Locomotive-engine Drivers' Union, and, if so, why?—I consider it would be a bad thing for the public service, and I believe it would be bad for this reason: that if two societies are recognized, then there is no ground for refusing three, or four, or five, as the case may be, and there comes in the element of division, which may grow and strengthen until the whole service is disintegrated; and I consider that there is far more danger of strikes and trouble arising out of that than by the existence of one solid body. My experience is this: that labour bodies even in a large form very seldom sit down deliberately and plan out a strike. A strike arises out of some other cause. It is only where the conflict between capital and labour is as acute as it is in the European continental countries that that element comes in.

*The Chairman.* I just want to say that quite a number of members who presented petitions on behalf of both the Amalgamated Society and the Locomotive-engine Drivers' Association would have been present but for being called away to attend at other Committees, and when they discovered that there were representatives on both sides attending this Committee, they of course stated that they would attend to their other duties, and leave the respective representatives to deal with the various matters before this Committee.

THOMAS RONAYNE examined. (No. 24.)

1 *Mr Craigie* ] How many sections could the Amalgamated Society subdivide into?—There would be a large number—engine-drivers, firemen, cleaners, blacksmiths, boilermakers, pattern-makers, machinists, fitters, carpenters, turners, tinsmiths, plumbers, trimmers, painters, and probably other trades.

2 *Mr Brown*.] And the porters and guards?—I was referring to the tradesmen. Yes, you could have the porters, guards, and signalmen, and so on *ad lib*

*Approximate Cost of Paper.*—Preparation, not given; printing (1,500 copies), £18 10s.

