not registered?—Yes, I think that Commissioners appointed in the same way as our present Conciliation Commissioners would be the best men to act in the first place, before disputes become complicated.

8. Yes, but you see this trouble would never have become so complicated if the Commissioners had had the power to go down and deal with the matter in the first place before the trouble spread?—If you mean that whether the industry is within the Act or outside the Act that there should be power for a man in the position of the Conciliation Commissioner to intervene—that he should have the right to intervene?—I agree with you.

9. *Mr. Okey.*] You say that a private firm like a shipping company should not be allowed to make an arrangement themselves?—I have submitted that there should always be a chairman—a fully qualified chairman, such as a Conciliation Commissioner—I am leaving out the merits or demerits of the present Conciliation Commissioners—and he should preside by right; and it should be imperative that in a dispute it should be settled with a neutral party as chairman, appointed by the Government. The parties need not be under the Arbitration Act as a whole, but when an agreement is come to there must be a method of giving it legal force.

10. *Mr. Atmore.*] In the case of a dispute between, say, the waterside workers or the seamen and a shipping company, and the company giving increased pay, that is passed on to the general public. You suggest an official chairman so that the interests of the general public may be protected?—I think the very presence of such a chairman would keep the parties within due bounds.

11. Take a hypothetical case. Supposing two parties have a dispute—employers and employees—do you not think there should be some check on them concluding an agreement that would be unfair to the third party, which is not represented—that is, the general public?—That is what I am trying to arrive at. You want some one who quietly by his presence and quiet advice will protect the interests of the general public, and that I am of opinion would be in the interests of the parties themselves.

12. Two parties—employers and employees—should not be allowed to conclude an agreement for the sake of peace if they are simply going to pass on the burden unfairly to the general public?—I am of opinion that at the present time in New Zealand the question of wages is not the first question in connection with industrial reforms. The conditions of labour is the first question, and whether it should be a six- or five-days week—as some unions have suggested—and that wages is the very last thing to-day in New Zealand with the majority of industries. With some industries that I might name it is the first thing. In one industry I have in my mind they only get 6s. a day, and wages is the first thing there; but in the majority of cases, to my mind, the question of wages is the last thing. What is wanted is to make the conditions suitable and healthy as regards hours and every other thing, and to bend our minds to devising means whereby what the workers do receive will go further than at present, so that the purchasing-power of the money they receive will be increased.

13. *Mr. Grenfell* (representing Employers' Association).] I understand that you support the provisions suggested by Mr. Carey for a compulsory conference of the parties in dispute?—Yes.

14. It is also suggested that the chairman at that conference should have the right of a vote?—We do not care about giving that.

15. *Hon. Mr. Millar.*] You take away the conciliation element altogether when you give the chairman a vote?—Yes.

TUESDAY, 18TH NOVEMBER, 1913.

JOHN WILLIAM FRANK MCDOUGALL examined. (No. 5.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Whom do you represent?—I am secretary of the Wellington Typographical Union, and I am here to represent that union and the following typographical unions: Auckland, Gisborne, Taranaki, Nelson, Canterbury, and Otago. I also represent the New Zealand Federated Typographical Association of Workers, which includes all the typographical unions of New Zealand.

2. You will understand that we are simply considering Part VI of the Bill?—Yes, I understand that. By way of introduction I may state that my union has, from its inception in 1862, always been a firm believer in conciliation and arbitration, and in its first book of rules the following interesting provision is found: "Should a dispute occur in any establishment regarding the privileges of the trade or the rate of wages or hours, the union, on the matter being referred to them, shall have power to submit the matter in dispute to the decision of the Arbitration Committee, on the following conditions: (*a.*) That both parties bind themselves in writing to abide by the decision of the Arbitration Committee. (*b.*) That the Arbitration Committee consist of two representatives from each interest—those representing the union to be appointed or elected by a special general meeting; such committee to elect a chairman (other than from among themselves), who shall, should the votes on any question be equal, decide the same by his casting-vote. (*c.*) That ascertained colonial usages shall be taken as the basis of action by the committee, but where such usages are found to be so varied as not to constitute custom the decision shall be based on equity and analogy." Notwithstanding that the rules have at various times and by different generations been revised and remodelled, this principle has always been upheld, and is contained in the rules of the union up to the present time. When the original Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act became the law of the land my union was one of the first to take advantage of its provisions, its registered number being fifteen, and the members during the whole course of the history of the union—the members celebrated its jubilee last year—have never taken part in a strike as a method of asserting their rights or settling any