

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL. Friday, 12th July, 1901. First Readings - Sessional Committees - Appoint- Inent

of the New Commandant - Standard Certi- ficates-Hospital Nurses Registration Bill-Local Authorities'

Indemnity Bill. The Hon. the SPEAKER took the chair at half- past two o'clock p.m. PRAYERS.

<page>326</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=354></url>

FIRST READINGS. Rhodes Trust Bill, Companies Bill, Property Law Bill, Mortgages of Land Bill.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES. SELECTION .- The Hon. Mr. Jenkinson, the Hon. Mr. Johnston, the Hon. Mr. Rigg, the Hon. Mr. Shrimski, and the Hon. Captain Baillie. JOINT ON BILLS .- The Hon. Mr. T. Kelly, the Hon. Colonel Pitt, the Hon. Mr. W. C. Walker, C.M.G., the Hon. Mr. Williams, and the Hon. Captain Baillie. JOINT STANDING ORDERS. -- The Hon. Mr. Feldwick, the Hon. Colonel Pitt, and the Hon.

Captain Baillie. APPOINTMENT OF THE NEW COM- MANDANT. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER laid on the table papers in reference to the appointment of the new Commandant. He desired, in doing so, to say a few words, and to state that the ap- pointment had been made on the recommen- dation of Field-Marshal Lord Roberts. They had been very much indebted to 'that dis- tinguished officer for friendly advice and other considerations, and on this occasion the Go- vernment thought the best thing to do in re- gard to the new appointment would be to ask the Field-Marshal if he would make a recom- mendation as to what he thought our service required, and he had recommended that Colonel St. George Henry should be ap- pointed Commandant for the next term of five years. The paper he was laying on the table showed the following record of service :- " Brevet-Colonel Henry has twenty-two years' full-pay service. He is the third on the list of majors of the 5th Regiment (Northumberland Fusiliers), being senior major of the 3rd Batta- lion. He was made brevet-lieutenant-colonel on the 6th July, 1899, and brevet-colonel on the 14th March, 1900, and is shown as having com- manded the 4th Corps of Mounted Infantry in South Africa since the 4th April, 1900. He served in the Dongola Expeditionary Force under Sir Herbert Kitchener in 1896. with the Camel Corps, including engagement at Firket and operations at Hafir, for which he was mentioned in despatches, and obtained a British medal and the Khedive's medal with two clasps ; in the operations in 1897 (clasp to Khedive's medal) ; in 1898 with the 1st Battalion of the Northumberland Fusiliers (5th Regiment) ; was present at the battle of Khartoum (mentioned in despatches), at the operations at Gedaref (mentioned in despatches), and in the operations in 1899, resulting in the final defeat of the Khalifa, in command of the Camel Corps Flying Column, and including the engagements at Abu Aadel and Om Dubreikat. He was appointed C.B. in 1901. The London Gazette of 16th April, 1901, states : Colonel St. G. Henry has repeatedly shown to advantage as a leader of men, and as commanding officer of the 4th Corps of Mounted Infantry he has done excellent service." So the Government had very little doubt as to the recommendation being a good one, and they had an officer to command our forces who had not only distinguished himself personally, but also had the most intimate acquaintance with modern systems. He had been working under the most successful organizer, from a military point of view-Lord Kitchener-and had also been in command of mounted infan- try in South Africa for a lengthened period. He trusted, therefore, the appointment would meet with the approval of the Council. The Hon. Mr. L. WALKER was understood to ask whether it was not advisable that the Commandant should be an artillery officer. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER was not pre- pared to question the proposition laid down by the honourable gentleman, but the first thing they required was a man to command our men. The Hon. Mr. L. WALKER .- And guns. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said, Guns also, no doubt ; but, still, the more technical knowledge of guns was a matter of # s. d. They could get a man to help them in that. The Hon. Mr. SCOTLAND asked what was the age of the new Commandant.

The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said he did not suppose he was more than forty. The Hon. Colonel PITT asked whether it was a fact that an artillery officer was on his way to the colony. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said he was not aware of it. They would, no doubt, require an artillery officer, but not as Commandant. The Hon. Mr. ORMOND said he did not know whether the papers laid on the table would give any information as to the conditions on which the new appointment was to be made. He would point out that, in a recent discussion about allegations of certain things that were said to have taken place in Wellington, the Premier was reported to have said that there was nobody in the colony who could demand an explanation from the head of the forces. If this condition of things were so, Parliament ought to be assured when the new appointment was made that no new Commandant, whoever he might be, should not be amenable to some authority in the colony - that was, the authority of those who represent Parliament, the Ministry of the day. This was a very important point indeed, and one which he meant to have raised if he had known more about the subject than he did ; but he knew enough to know that it was altogether contrary to the principles of representative government that any officer in the colony should not be amenable at all times to give an explanation to the Government of the day. He should be glad if the Minister would make some inquiry as to whether that had been provided for in the appointment that had been made. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said there was a certain amount of misconception about the matter, as was shown by the honourable gentleman's questions. There was no doubt that anybody who was appointed to any position in the colonial forces, or in the colonial service, was amenable to his Minister. He had got to account for himself in every shape and

<page>327</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=355></url>

form to the Minister, and, of course, from a strictly military point of view, to the Governor as a still higher authority : but as to what the honourable gentleman referred to, the setting-up of the court-martial to inquire into that matter and the action of the Commandant, it was an utter impossibility from a military point of view. It was absurd to suppose that the Commandant, or any other officer appointed by the Minister, was not responsible to the Minister, who controlled everything he did. As to the new appointment, he believed it was the same as the last one-for \$700 a year, with an engagement for five years. The Hon. Mr. JONES said, Supposing the Commandant, although he was responsible to his Minister, should chafe at any interference, what would be the position then ? Would it be possible for him to be summarily dismissed, or would the colony have to keep him during the whole term of his engagement ? This was very important. Of course, the honourable gentleman representing the Government had assured the Council that the choice would be made with the greatest care and on the recommendation of the highest authority, perhaps, in the military world : but we have had such recommendations made before, and the persons who had been recommended had not been quite satisfactory to this colony. They had an instance of this in the gentleman who at present occupied the position of Commandant. He hoped that an appointment would be made of some military authority in the colony. It might be that that idea was due to his ignorance of the subject, but late military developments had demonstrated that those military men who had been accustomed to rough warfare were the men who were likely to figure prominently in the wars of the future. At any rate, they had done the best service in the war in South Africa. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said he had listened with the greatest interest to what had been said. He had only stated, for the information of the Council, what it was his duty to intimate ; and if any honourable gentleman wished to challenge the appointment, or the terms of the appointment, his proper course was to table a motion. STANDARD CERTIFICATES. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS asked the Minister of Education, Whether the right of giving certificates, as required by the Education Act, of passing the standards is denied to pupils attending any scholastic institution in the colony, thereby inflicting an injustice on some pupils by preventing them from obtaining employment in

the public service of the colony ? He asked this question in consequence of a letter he had received from a gentleman who at one time occupied one of the highest educational positions in the colony. At present he had a training-college in Auckland, and the letter to him (Mr. Jennings) stated that he had written to the department some time ago asking that the right of giving certificates on passing the standards should be allowed in his college to his pupils, as a similar privilege had been given to institutions in Auckland conducted on the same lines as his own. He felt, not having received any reply from the department to his request, that his pupils should be placed in such a position that if they were desirous of entering the Civil Service they should not be debarred because these certificates were not granted. The name of the gentleman was Mr. Malcolm, of the Auckland Training College. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said, Of course, children attending the public schools got the standard certificates as provided under the regulations. As regards the Roman Catholic schools, it was felt to be a hardship, as far as they were concerned, that they should be debarred from entering the public service, or any other service where standard certificates were required, because they were not attending public schools. For nine years it had been the practice that in each diocese of the Roman Catholic Church the Bishops appointed examiners and inspectors, who were approved of by the department, and on their verdict the standard certificates were issued to all children presenting themselves to him, so that the Catholic children were protected all over the colony wherever the Catholic authorities chose to avail themselves of it, so far as the public service was concerned. There was another question involved, and that was where the ordinary Inspectors were also examining these schools and issuing standard certificates. Well, the practice was not uniform. In some districts the Inspectors were instructed to inspect them and give certificates : in other districts they did not. That was a matter the Government could not interfere with. In regard to the matter of personal complaint that the honourable gentleman had indicated in his question, he was sorry the honourable member had not informed him of the matter before he rose to speak, so that he (Mr. Walker) might have been perfectly clear as to the point at issue. If he had been able to inform himself, of course, he could have given the necessary answer, but at the present time. he could only tell the honourable member that if he would bring the matter to him personally after the rising of the Council he would look into it and endeavour to see that his friend received every consideration ; but the intention of the Government was to put the Catholic children at no disadvantage, so far as the public service was concerned, in regard to passing the standard examinations. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS might say at once that his question did not raise the subject of Catholic schools at all. Mr. Malcolm, who had a training college in Auckland, stated that he applied in a public manner for the same privilege as that accorded a similar institution in Auckland to the one he had, and no reply had been given him. Therefore, to prevent injustice being done to Mr. Malcolm's pupils, he thought it his duty, with the consent of the gentleman who wrote him, to bring the question forward in a public manner. An Hon. MEMBER .-- What is the training college ? The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS said it was a college

<page>328</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=356></url>

for preparing pupils for the many requirements which were expected in the various walks of life. It was called the Auckland Training College, and good results had been attained by Mr. Malcolm. HOSPITAL NURSES REGISTRATION BILL. On the question, That this Bill be read the third time, The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS said,-Before the honourable member moves the third reading of this Bill I would like to ask him a question. I regret that, owing to indisposition, I could not be in my place in the Council yesterday. I wish to ask whether subsection (4) of section 4, which provides that nurses must register on or before the 30th June, 1902, has this effect : Suppose there are nurses-and I know of some in the country districts-who may not be aware of the time for registration, will they be debarred altogether from obtaining a certificate ? The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- I beg to move that this Bill be recommitted for the

purpose of adding a certain paragraph to subsection (4) of section 4. There were two points yesterday that were, so to speak, left in suspense. One was in regard to the definition of a hospital, when the hospital was not in New Zealand. Well, I contended yesterday that, as the Minister had the power of approving of a qualification established by any hospital outside New Zealand, it was pretty well safeguarded ; but I propose to add to that clause the following words: "if equivalent in training and examination to what is required from New Zealand nurses under this Act." We wish to put them on the same footing; we do not wish to bring in any nurses under false pretences, nor any one who will be likely to bring down the standard of the profession which we wish to establish here. We think that will carry out the intention of the Act in the fairest possible way, and I really think that is better than attempting to define what a hospital outside of New Zealand is. If the hospital imparts a similar training and similar qualification to our own I would say recognise it as a hospital under our Act. Therefore I move, That the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of reconsidering subsection (4) of section 4. The Hon. Colonel PITT .- Sir, I would ask the Minister whether he will at the same time consider the point raised by me yesterday in reference to subsection (1) of clause 4? I suggested to him that there might be the same danger in reference to those persons who had three years' training as to the nurses to whom the Hon. Mr. Jennings referred in connection with subsection (4). They might not have the certificate, although they had the training, and there should be some limited period in which they could prove to the Registrar that they had the training. I would ask that subsection (1) should be recommitted also. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER. - I had forgotten that point. I will move also That subsection (1) be recommitted, for the purpose of altering the word. "passing of the Act" to "first day of January, one thousand nine hundred and two." Motion agreed to. Bill recommitted and reported. LOCAL AUTHORITIES' INDEMNITY BILL. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- Before I move the second reading of this Bill I would like to ask the Council to suspend the Standing Orders to enable this Bill to go through all its stages at this sitting. It is simply a Bill to relieve certain local bodies from the obligations they entered into in connection with the Royal visit ; and the other House having passed the Bill, I hope this Council will have no hesitation in putting them out of their misery as soon as possible. I move, That the Standing Orders be suspended. Motion agreed to. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- This Bill, of which I now beg to move the second reading, is simply framed in consequence of difficulties which arose when the Royal visit was contemplated, and it was found that the Municipal Corporations Act of last session limited Municipalities to expend on functions of that sort simply the small amount of \$50 a year. I must say that that showed a certain amount of want of foresight on the part of the Parliament, that it should say that \$50 was to be the amount to be so expended, irrespective of the size of the Municipality, its requirements, its duties, and its rating powers. Because I maintain that, while \$50 a year might be an extraordinary profligate sum for some boroughs in this country to spend on functions of that kind, the metropolitan boroughs might wish to spend a hundred times as much, or as much as they like, on such an occasion. But the clause passed last session absolutely hampered the municipal authorities in dealing adequately from a municipal point of view with what they conceived to be their duties regarding our late Royal visitors. The Ministers were referred to on the subject, and promised to put the matter before Parliament and endeavour to get an Indemnity Bill passed, so as to put the Municipalities in a right position. The position is that the Municipalities have risen to the occasion, and have incurred liabilities which they are now waiting to pay, honestly believing that Parliament would relieve them of this obligation, and extend the Act for this particular occasion. I hope they will receive every consideration, and therefore move the second reading of this Bill, which makes their action lawful. The Hon. Mr. SCOTLAND .- I wish to ask whether this Bill will indemnify local authorities for the whole of their expenditure without exception ? The Hon. Mr. JONES .- I suppose that this is a measure which we must pass whether we like it or not. It was promised to the local bodies by the Premier, who stated that he would bring in a measure of this nature, the assumption being that he would

get it passed by the Legislature. But I would point out tha

<page>329</page>

<url>https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=357</url>

privilege-fifteen thousand people in our dis- there was more money spent in connection with triet were refused this privilege. The peeple the Roval reception by public bodies and pri- from the country districts wished to go to vate individuals than there was any necessity Oamaru-mothers, and fathers, and children- for. In this case, as in many other cases, we might have set an example to the whole world. if they had been afforded the opportunity, and I do not think that loyalty should be measured they would have seen Royalty and have gone home quite satisfied. But there was a neces- by wealth : yet we found the cities of New Zea- sity, I suppose, for pandering to the big cities as land competing with one another as to how usual. There was need that the railway reve- much they should spend, and how they should nue should be increased, and what do we find ? spend it : and we found them all competing, -that if any of our citizens or country settlers aiso. with Sydney and Melbourne. Now, I am from North Otago or South Canterbury wanted perfectly certain that Royalty never expected to see Royalty and pay their respects to them as anything of this sort, and if we had only done loyal subjects of the King, they must go either everything decently and modestly-if we had to Dunedin or Christchurch by rail, necessi- conserved our wealth for better purposes-I am tating an absence from their homes for two or quite sure that our Royal visitors and their entourage would have been quite as highly three days at least, and an expenditure of seve. ral pounds. Now, I say that this is too great a pleased as they were when they left the colony. strain to put on any person's loyalty. It does Sir. the arch-fiend was too much in evidence. not matter how loyal a person may be, if he has to I would like to ask honourable gentlemen suffer inconvenience of that sort, if he has to put what good the arches were. I think if we had a little greenery displayed in our towns, in up at hotels at great cost, and take his children the shape of arches, festoons, and so forth, they to boot, then I say it is too much to expect. would have been much more characteristic and It was only at the last moment, and after I had much less vulgar. I do not mean to say that I spoken to two or three members of the Ministry, that we got the concession made that Royalty would defend the cutting-down of the beautiful would remain fifteen minutes, or thereabouts, trees in the forests for that purpose. Indeed, at Oamaru. Of course, we were much obliged I must say here that I consider it is a shame that trees should have been bodily cut down- for the concession, but the evil was done-the demonstration was spoilt. It was said that fern-trees, and other beautiful trees-for the purpose of making the display. There was no somebody asked what was the matter with the necessity whatever for it. The trees might have people of Oamaru that they could not raise a been denuded of their branches and leaves, and cheer. The fact of the matter is that the bulk they would then have come on again in another of the people of Oamaru were in Dunedin. They had taken rooms at the hotels in that season ; but there was no necessity to cut whole trees down to their very roots in order to city, because they had been denied over and get the greenery. There is another point I wish over again the privilege of seeing Royalty in to refer to. I cannot sympathize with those Oamaru. Now, I think that was very bad who, having the management of this affair, treatment, and it is not at all in keeping with decreed that certain dress should be worn on democratic principles, nor is it consonant with certain occasions. We do not wish to set up the principles of that decentralisation which an aristocracy of clothing in this country. the configuration of New Zealand renders abso- An Hon. MEMBER .- We have done it. lutely necessary in the interests of its people. The Hon. Mr. JONES .- Well. let us make a retrograde movement in the direction of pro- prised to hear my honourable friend go on in the manner in which he has done about Minis- gress, and let us do away with that sort of feeling-that the man who has the most loval ters. I thought he was such an ardent sup- heart is the man who wears the most expensive porter of the Government, and that he always jewel-bedecked shirt-front. costing 5d. at the supported them in everything. laundry. Sir, I consider that tawdry display is not becoming the people

of New Zealand. Ministers. The tribute of the little Dublin boy who, seeing the newspaper poster announcing the death gentleman said Ministers did everything ; and of the Queen, bought a bunch of violets at a he said he saw Ministers, and that, after a great penny and pinned it over the name of the deal of trouble, they acquiesced in his request Queen was as noble and as loyal as anything to get their Royal Highnesses to stop for a that has ever been recorded in the history of the quarter of an hour at Oamaru. Sir, if Oamaru wide world, and shows that there is no necessity is unfortunate in the position in which she is to make a vulgar display by means of a large to-day, my honourable friend is a good deal to expenditure of wealth in order to exhibit our blame for it. He helped to aid and assist in its loyalty. Now, I want to make a reference to downfall. the treatment which Oamaru suffered at the hands of those who had the management of into Parliament. the Royal visit. For several weeks the people of Oamaru besought the authorities, through to that at all. It is the honourable member and the Premier, to allow Royalty to remain at the like of him who help to put Oamaru in the Oamaru for a few minutes in order that they unfortunate position she occupies at the present time. I unfortunately was single-handed in this might pay their respects to them in a decent and humble way. But, Sir, we were refused this Chamber to fight against the many Bills which The Hon. Mr. SHRIMSKI .-- I am really sur- The Hon. Mr. JONES .- I did not refer to The Hon. Mr. SHRIMSKI .- The honourable The Hon. Mr. JONES .--- I helped to put you The Hon. Mr. SHRIMSKI. - I am not referring

<page>330</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=358></url>

were passed, and which aided and assisted in | indulgence. I rise for the purpose of saying bringing Oamaru down to where it is at the present time. Sir, I remember the time when Oamaru was the fifth or sixth town in the colony. But what is Oamaru to-day ? I suppose she is only about the thirteenth or fourteenth, and it is all through the influence of this great advocate here to-day, and his wonderful newspaper. I happened to be in Oamaru at the time when His Royal Highness passed along. I take a little interest still in Oamaru, and I can only say this-my honourable friend was not on the spot ; but I was there : that, humble though the reception was, it was one of the best sights outside the large cities that I witnessed. It is true the people, in consequence of the position they occupy, are a little low-spirited, and that the cheering was not so bright and lively as I should have liked to see it. But still the sight was there-hundreds of children were there, and they sung the Royal Anthem, and everything passed off very nicely. Sir, I say it is owing to my honourable friend and his associates that we see Oamaru in the unfortunate position in which she is at the present time. But, Sir, the Government know they can depend on Mr. Jones, and they know they can depend on the Minister of Lands, and they know they need never do anything for the people in the district, because they are bound to the Government hand and foot. and they must vote as the Government tell them. The Hon. Mr. JONES .- Why did you leave us ? The Hon. Mr. SHRIMSKI. - Because I wished to cut the like of you. I could not stand it any longer. It was first supposed that their Royal Highnesses were to lunch at Oamaru, but, I suppose, on account of the Minister for Public Works being a resident of Timaru, the scene was changed, and Timaru was made the place instead of Oamaru ; poor Oamaru has no advocate since I left it, and the result is that all these little things happen. Now my honourable friend Mr. Jones feels aggrieved ; but he should not do so, as he is responsible. He is too selfish for his own purposes against the interests of the people. I am proud to say that if I had been there we should have had the Duke there. But my honourable friend is bound hand and foot, and has to do as he is told, and cannot speak his mind freely and independently as he should do to advocate the Hence he gets his interests of his people. reward. The Hon. Mr. SCOTLAND .- I wish to know, Sir, whether, having asked the Minister a question previously, I have forfeited my right to speak. The Hon. the SPEAKER .-- The honourable gentleman may speak, with the consent of the Council. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- I do not want to interfere with the honourable gentleman, but I do not think any

member should be allowed to speak twice. The Hon. Mr. SCOTLAND .- I do not wish to force myself on the attention of the Council, but I should like to say a word or two with their that, instead of this being a Bill to indemnify the municipal bodies for their expenditure on the late auspicious occasion, I could wish it had been a Bill to fine them for their outrageous violation of the laws of good taste. I speak more especially with regard to Auckland, because I did not witness the reception in any other town in New Zealand. Indeed, I did not witness it. in Auckland itself ; I merely had a view of the decorations after the ceremony was all over, and I must say my feelings of taste-and I hope it is good taste -were horribly outraged by what I saw in the streets of Auckland. How the citizens of Auckland could have imagined that these horrible monstrosities of arches and other so-called decorations were going to make an impression upon the Prince and Princess, accustomed as they are to the good taste and magnificence of Europe, I cannot imagine. An Hon. MEMBER .- It was a contrast. The Hon. Mr. SCOTLAND .- Well, perhaps that may have afforded them some amusement. I should very much like to have heard the remarks of their Royal Highnesses to each other after the ceremony was over. Not only were they bailed up and bored by the citizens of Auckland with addresses at almost every street corner, but they had to pass under arches which were in direct violation of good taste. The show at Rotorua was certainly something new and original, and I have it on good authority that their Royal Highnesses were more pleased with that exhibition than with anything they saw in Auckland. But democracies are notorious for violating good taste in most things; they go to excess in everything almost. I am reminded of a passage in one of the comedies of Aristophanes. He said, speaking of the Demos of Athens. " Demos is a very good fellow in his own house. but when he goes to a public meeting he is apt to run wild," although the Athenians, being an æsthetical people, would never have been such offenders against the canons of good taste as we Britishers generally are. That is the case with the citizens of this colony. They go to a meeting to get up a demonstration of some kind. A proposes one thing ; B wants to go one better-to use a sporting phrase-and so they go on. each proposing something more ridiculous than the last speaker, until the whole thing becomes a perfect farce. Surely a simple and respectful address on the part of the Municipality ought to have been sufficient ; why compel their Royal Highnesses to listen to all this fulsome twaddle, the production of a lot of Auckland shopkeepers? It is quite ridiculous. I venture to say that not half a dozen men of education had the slightest voice in the management of matters in Auckland on the occasion, and I believe it was so in all the other towns. The whole thing was bungled and vulgarised. and I hope should any Royal Highnesses visit the colony again such absurdities will not be repeated. That is not the rational way of showing one's loyalty - bawling " God save the King," and " Rule Britannia," very much

<page>331</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=359></url>

out of tune. These things are all very well in under the finger-nails. I do not think that their way, but they are worn threadbare, and is democracy. I think that a democrat may have become almost a nuisance. Then, these also be a gentleman, and there is no reason displays of Volunteers-they do not appear, by on earth why he should not be a gentleman, to have been very well treated. more man. I say that the true democrat is the best especially in Wellington, nor the cadets in of gentlemen, for the reason that he is unselfish, Christchurch. Of course, I know it is no use and does not desire everything for himself, but is getting up to say anything on the subject, ex-desirous of an equal distribution of it through- cept to pay greasy compliments and pour out out the country. That is my conception of extravagant praise. Englishmen will be Eng- democracy. And then there is this screaming about militarism ; but is there a country on lishmen and go to extremes in everything, and I believe if any Royal personages from England earth that does not make some provision for came here again in a week's time the same non- its own protection ? Self-preservation is the sense would be repeated. That is all I have to first law of nature, and,

if an individual protects av. I would rather have got up to praise the himself, surely aggregations of individuals may people of Auckland or the colony for their loyal provide for their self-protection also. Now, that being so, is it not right that we should demonstrations on this occasion, but I really could not conscientiously do so. train our young men for the purpose of render- The Hon. Mr. TWOMEY .- I should have ing them fit to protect us in the day of danger. very much regretted this debate only for the It is to be hoped, and it is my fervent wish, diversion created by the ever-recurring Oamaru that we may never see the day when we shall picnic. It is a very pitiable position Oamaru be called upon to fight, but if we are to be called is in, according to the Hon. Mr. Shrimski, but upon to fight it is only right and proper that we should be fully prepared, and that preparation I do not know how my honourable friend cannot be obtained unless we train our young men Mr. Jones contributed to that. So far as I know land settlement has gone on in Oamaru, to bear arms. For my part, I am entirely opposed to this colony having a standing army, for I and this settlement has been greatly fostered and promoted by the Hon. Mr. Jones. It ought see no necessity for it. We have seen that we have men willing and able to bear arms while to have increased the population there, and the increase of population ought to improve the following at the same time their ordinary condition of the town. But it appears the re- avocations, and thus prepare themselves for defending the colony. That has been proved sult has been in an inverse ratio. I regret the beyond a question of a doubt, and I think utterances very much which have fallen from honourable gentlemen on this subject. I think that to promote Volunteering for self-protec- the Hon. Mr. Jones is too utilitarian in his tion or for the protection of the colony is right, and that to call that militarism is a views. I think on the occasion of the visit misuse of the English language, and it is a of the King's son, the Heir-Apparent to the Throne. our future King, we may be pardoned word that is not properly understood. I do if we tried to put our right foot forward and not think there was anything improper done on the occasion of the Royal visit. I think appeared as well as possible before him. We that what was done redounded greatly to our must bear in mind that we are a part of a credit, and will repay us tenfold. There ac- great Empire; and it is only fitting that we companied the Royal visitors here journalists should show that. as a part of that Empire, from England-not only from England, but we are worthy of it. I am very sorry-and representative journalists of all the world. I have tried to impress it upon others- There were present representatives of Reu- that these questions have been raised, and a ter's Agency and the Central News. These splendid thing partially spoiled in this way. gentlemen were every day cabling Home We gave the Royal visitors a magnificent re- to their journals an account of New Zealand. ception, and it is a great pity that anything and what will the effect of that be ? It will should be done or said to mar its splendour. There has been a great deal said about de- be this: that we have got the greatest adver- tisement we ever could get for the colony. Now mocracy, so much that I am not sure that I Zealand is painted by these gentlemen as a know what democracy is. I am beginning to perfect paradise, and we shall before long have think that I know nothing at all about the a flood of tourists and others coming in here meaning of democracy, and that it is something that will recoup us for the money spent on the altogether foreign to my conception of it. One occasion of the Royal visit. person tells me that if I wear a dress suit the same as worn at a ball, which has been the fashion to wear from time immemorial, then I that. am undemocratic. If I wear clean clothes, and that a gentleman so highly cultured and so brush my coat, and am neat in my apparel, imaginative as my honourable friend Mr. Jones then I am undemocratic. I suppose I will be should be so deficient in artistic taste as to told that I must not clean my finger-nails, be- deery that which was so ornamental and so cause if I do so I shall be deemed undemo- well calculated to beautify our cities and the cratic. Well, my conception of democracy is places through which the Roval visitors passed. that it is that which elevates and gives equal I do not think that even that expenditure was advantages to all, but that it does not mean wasted. that one must be rude and uncultured, wear try. It showed it was a land flowing with milk bad clothes, and allow dirt to accumulate The Hon. Mr. JONES .- The arches could do The Hon. Mr.

TWOMEY .- I am surprised It showed the prosperity of the coun-

<page>332</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=360></url>

and honey, that there was an artistic taste in our people, and that they had the wealth to give expression to that artistic taste ; and in many ways these arches and other decorations were the coping-stone to the whole ceremony. I say that, taking all these circumstances into account, the preparations were well done, the ceremonies passed off with every success, and the result will be greatly to the advantage of the colony. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS .- Sir, I just wish to say a word in connection with the subject of the Royal visit. I believe that two circumstances that occurred will stand out in the future as mementoes of that visit. One is the great Maori demonstration at Rotorua, which was unexampled in our history, and really a sight which was worth going thousands of miles to see ; the other was the laying of the foundation-stone of the Maori Girls' College at Auckland by the Duchess of Cornwall and York. While a lot of the other tawdry embellishments in connection with that visit will fade away, those two events will ever remain in the memory of the Royal visitors and others who witnessed them. I trust the Government will I other town for a similar length of time. how see its way clear to assist that very desirable institution-the Maori Girls' College in Auckland-the foundation-stone of which was laid by the Duchess of York. The Hon. Mr. BOLT .- I fail to see the object of this discussion. The money for which the Bill provides was spent by the local bodies with the general concurrence of the people immediately concerned, and it appears to me that all we have do to is to pass this Bill, so that all those who expended the money shall be indemnified. So far as this debate has gone, as I said before, I do not see what object is to be served by it. It seems to me that it may be looked on only as a sort of finishing-up of the amusement connected with the Royal visit. The charges that have been brought against democracy by my honourable friend Mr. Scotland seemed to me very absurd. The honourable gentleman is so filled with the spirit of utilitarianism that he would consider that he had done enough on a great occasion of this sort by simply presenting a formal address. Well, if his patriotism is of such a character that there is to be no self-sacrifice connected with a visit of this sort, and no money expended, I do not think that his patriotism amounts to very much. I look upon the expenditure that has taken place in this colony as a very proper expenditure under the circumstances. It was a unique event, a great occasion, and I think the expenditure has certainly not been too much. I have no sympathy with this spirit which professes to feel that a great occasion of this sort should be met in a cheap and nasty way. Therefore I think the criticism regarding the expenditure is not justified, and I do not think we should go any further with it, but simply pass this Bill. Indeed, we have very little to do with it. It is the money of the public bodies, and the public bodies practically have already indorsed the expenditure. The Hon. Mr. PINKERTON .- Sir, I to some extent regret that a debate of this kind has cropped up. I think it would have been far better to pass the Bill and say nothing about it. I think the colony itself quite understood that this Parliament would indemnify there local bodies when they incurred expenses beyond the legal limit. But, Sir, it is refreshing to know that there are one or two individuals who know more than all the rest of the four centres of the colony. They tell us that the people in the four different centres were a parcel of fools and asses, and that they alone have the sense and wisdom to know how to receive Royalty or any great personage. Sir, I take it that the persons in the different centres who thought this thing out, and who desired to carry it out, and who carried it out well, will have given every satisfaction to the Royal visitors ; and I think now, Sir, when that has been done, that the least this Parliament can do is to indemnify the local bodies and the Borough Councils who have incurred expense. As to the Oamaru fight, we get that occasionally, and I am not going to make very much of it. But supposing the Royal visitors had been entertained at Oamaru for half a day or a day, and in every long would it have taken them to go through the colony ? The Hon. Mr. JONES .- I never asked that. The Hon. Mr. PINKERTON .-- I do not know what was asked for, but the honourable

member complained very loudly that more attention should have been given to Oamaru, and that Timaru was favoured against Oamaru. The Hon. Mr. JONES .- I never said a word about Timaru. The Hon. Mr. PINKERTON .- If the honour- able gentleman did not, somebody else did. Sir. the Royal visitors had a duty to perform, given them. no doubt, by the Crown of England. They carried it out to the best of their ability, and. I think, to the entire satisfaction of the people of New Zealand and the colonies generally. S.r. I have nothing more to say, except that i exceedingly regret that a debate of this kind has been raised. I hope there will be very little more, and that the Bill will be passed and the indemnity given. The Hon. Mr. REEVES .- Sir, I quite agree with the expression that has fallen from m. honourable friend. I think the colony so far has done very well indeed in the reception of their Royal Highnesses, and the few paltry pounds we have spent will not come to very much after all when you come to reckon it up. There is only one blot on the whole thing. i. you can call it a blot, and that was that they did not go to the West Coast. If they had gone there it would have been the coping-stone to the whole reception. There they would have got a royal West Coast reception, and would have seen the finest country in New Zealsad That is all I have to say. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- I only wish to tell my honourable friend Mr. Scotland that. so far as I know, this Bill covers the whok expenditure that the Municipalities are liable for Bill read the second and the third time. The Council adjourned at four o'clock p.m.

<page>333</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=361></url>

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. [in the same manner in all respects as an in- dustrial agreement duly executed and filed by Friday, 12th July, 1901. the parties." Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill-Cyanide clause by repealing the words " or any of." Process Extension Bill-Public Health Bili- It is necessary that that amendment should be Trustee Bill-Chinese Immigrants Bill-Acei- made so as to prevent that situation. Clause 10 dents Compensation Bill-The Contingents on the Steamer " Tagus "- Referendum Bill. is rendered necessary because it has been found that some of the largest unions. notably the Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at half-past Seamen's Union, were absolutely prevented ten o'clock. from passing a resolution to bring their case under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. as PRAYERS. they never could get a majority of members INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND present in any one place. I may say that the ARBITRATION BILL. shearers and miners also found the same diffi- Mr. SEDDON (Minister of Labour) .- Sir, culty. It is really a transposition. The pro- honourable members who have perused this vision is all right, but it got into the wrong Bill will have seen from its nature that it is place, and we have got to hark back and put it purely of a technical character. There is no large right. Then, clause 11 is to prevent any departure-in fact, scarcely a departure at all- intimidation or revenge. The necessity for from the principles obtaining and which have this has been occasioned in respect to the obtained in regard to the laws on our statute- disputes at Waihi and at Christchurch. The book. Being a Bill of the character named, I amending Act of 1895 allowed retrospective will give the reasons and the necessity for the protection for six weeks, but in the consolidat- alterations proposed. If honourable members ing Act of 1890 by some action this was left will turn to clause 3 they will find that under open. It is quite clear that the employers have the principal Act there is no power to make a the power, when they hear that one of their foreign company, carrying on business through employés becomes a member of a union, or an agent under a power of attorney, register as takes office in a union, or they fancy or have a union of employers. Obviously, therefore that some evidence that their employés are about to must be met, and the law perfected. Clause 4 take action to improve their position-they can, is desired for the purpose of enabling trade- on such grounds, or probably without having unions to be parties to an industrial agreement, any ground at all to which exception could be and clause 7 provides that they shall be bound taken, discharge their employés. The men by an award. Now the employers and industrial would be in such a position that they could / unions in a district are bound by an award, not carry on their

unions under such circumstances - while a dissenting trade union will not be stances. I think there ought to be retro-bound. Clause 5 is rendered necessary because speculative power given, and in actions such as it has been found that the old maxim has been taken at the Waihi Mine and applied to it: "You may pass any law you like, but the lawyers will drive a coach-and-evidence on that point is very clear -- in fact, the four through it." Whilst we have decided by manager subsequently admitted it. That does law that members of the legal profession shall not, of course, recoup the men who have been not appear. they have got over that difficulty by thrown out of employment for a number of being made attorneys for either party, and as weeks. What we want to do is to make the law attorneys the Court has decided that they may as perfect as we can to prevent these contingencies arising. There is nothing further in appear. the Bill. It may probably be said that we meet that. Mr. R. THOMPSON .- They will be too many ought to let these matters rest ; but where a for you. no matter what you do. measure is purely experimental in its character. Mr. SEDDON .- I am afraid that is so ; but, then, if we find in working the legislation at all events, we can lock the stable-door against that Courts point out defects, it is surely our duty to rectify them. As I have said, there is their appearing as attorneys. It obviously puts nothing in the Bill with the exception of things on an equal footing. The only way to cause 11. There is no new principle in the stop it would be to say that they might appear, but must not get anything for it. I believe Bill : it is simply a Bill to remove difficulties found in the working of the Act. I move the that that would probably meet the case. I think you will admit that they are a necessary second reading of the Bill. evl. Clause 57 of the principal Act is as follows :- Speaker, it becomes one's duty to give an expression of opinion upon an amendment relating to Acts that have been in existence, and have been dated is filed. all or any of the parties to the pretty well tested over the colony during the reference may by memorandum of consent in last few years, and especially when one's the prescribed form, executed by themselves or opinion is diametrically opposed to the state- their attorneys (but not by their representations made with regard to the working of these tivist, and filed in the office of the Clerk. agree measures by the Premier, and also by gentlemen to accept the recommendation of the Board, in prominent positions who claim that industry- and in such case the Board's recommendation, trial peace, order, and also good-will and amity when filed, shall operate and be enforceable Now, clause 6 of the present Bill amends the Mr. MONK (Waitemata). - I think, Mr.

<page>334</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=362></url>

exist between employers and employed. Now, 1 my own feeling, Sir, is that these statements are utterly incorrect ; and let me state, as I have before said in this House, that I am a believer in unions. I believe it is only right for workmen-in fact, for those in every class of employment if they choose-to form themselves into unions for protection against the avarice of some employers ; and also that they may have a combination to operate in recognition of the ebb and flow of industrial values that occur in the community-when there is high water or flood-tide in industries it is right they take advantage of it equally with the employers, who are using their accumulated resources called capital. I believe that to be quite right. But, as I have before stated, I believe the compulsory machinery now being brought into operation has created a continuous feeling of agitation and distrust in the minds of that portion of the commonwealth whom it would be wise to induce to venture their means in the employment of their fellows. It was said last night by the Premier-I think I am not improper in referring to a previous debate- An Hon. MEMBER. - I think you are. Mr. MONK .- Well, I need not mention last night or any time. It is a continuous echo from the lips of the Premier, and also from the Agent-General in Great Britain, that we in New Zealand are in a period of industrial havoc of peace and quietude. Why, Sir, never before was such a condition of chronic industrial war and disturbance as at the present time ; every journal abounds

continuously in reports of industrial contention, and it has been induced by the legislation that we have passed. Mr. SEDDON .- Compare New Zealand with Westralia at the present time. There they have three thousand railway men on strike. Mr. MONK .- Strikes there startle because of their infrequency, but they are continuous strikes here: there is not a moment of peace in this country, and as far as possible employers will withdraw their capital. What we have done has been to affright that class in the Old Country that we should try to induce to venture their means in speculation here. Do you think the last action which was taken by the Conciliation Board with reference to the mining industry will not be the means of throwing men out of work? Of course it will not affect those who are engaged in profitable mining-it will not hurt them at all -- and it is only equitable that the workman should participate in their good fortune ; and had there been a combination without legislative action- simply unions-I believe because of profitable results in those mines quite as good, or even better, remuneration than now would have been obtained : but the present legislative surveillance admits of no elasticity of compromise. Do you think persons are going to pay their money in high wages for speculative effort, or what are called prospecting operations in mining, when it is doubtful if they will get any return ? I think not ; it is not in human nature. And you must deal with these matters according to the impulses that influence human nature and according to the economic laws that govern society. The statement has been made by no less authorities than gentlemen of the Supreme Court that the unions may demand from employers that they shall bring their books into Court. I believe if you had an agreement of conciliation between the employers and the employés, and if you had the mutuality that would set up Boards of Arbitration among themselves-a certain number of the most capable and thoughtful of those who receive wages and an equal number of those paying wages- and they would meet together, the one claiming that they should receive more remuneration than they were receiving and the other that they were not able to pay more-I say that in such cases as those it is most desirable and necessary that the books should be placed before such a combination of the two interests. This is a practice that in some instances is being carried out in the Old Country, and it is one that safeguards the statement of the employers as to their inability to give a higher rate of wages, while the reasonableness or otherwise of the claims made by employés can be proved. I am speaking from my own knowledge of these matters, and I know that statements have been made before the Conciliation Board of wages that are being paid now, and wages that are being claimed. that are far below those that I paid years ago. It is not so much the rate of wages now being paid, but it is the feeling of unrest, the want of finality, as to what may follow, for surely there is no one here who does not know that in these cases there must be continuous progress- whether right or wrong, our aspirations grow by what they feed on. It is wisely ordered that. as we are enabled to improve our conditions. they make us dissatisfied with the level of those conditions, whether selfish or noble, and we want to ascend to a higher plane, and such feelings promote that industrial energy and readiness to speculate which ought to be the normal condition of our communities. It has been stated by the Premier " that there is not one of us who would dare to vote for the repeal of any of these labour measures that have been introduced." Sir, I say that any one may write "coward" after my name if, with respect to such matters as those I am now talking of, I shall hesitate to speak against them, and with my latest breath I will vote against tyrannical legislation : not that I do not believe in unions, but I do not believe in the arbitrary action now being practised. There are two gentlemen in our community who have had an immense influence on our sociology - one on the native maritime affairs of this country. I am alluding now to the honourable member for Dunedin City (Mr. Millar), and the Premier, who claims he has been doing so much for labour. What is the result at the present time"? The maritime aspirations of the youth of New Zealand are completely effaced, and our young people, and the best of them, are going to other parts of the world to acquire that education that is denied to them in this country. There is no gain- saving it, and we members know it well. If the honourable gentleman is not informed of it

he ought to be, and if he is informed of it he ought to be more candid in the statements he makes before this House. Now, Sir, it seems to me that in a country like this it should be the boast of the young people of the colony that the land of the Moa, like the home of their ancestors, is ocean-girt, and one of the charms of that home is that one cannot go many miles to the right hand or to the left but the vista of ocean either gladdens the senses with the rippling beauty of a gentle sea. or the spirits are stirred in sympathetic excitement at the turbulent frolic of the storm-driven waves, these feelings revealing the atavism of Viking blood still lurking in our veins : and there is nothing more natural than that one of the foremost of the national aspirations of the young people of New Zealand is that they should be a maritime people. Have you got one young man in this country who is now practising and endeavouring to acquire the maritime profession for his permanent occupation in life? Not one. And yet I remember the time when they were abounding from one end of the country to the other. I can mention the names of many who are now-not in New Zealand, but in other parts of the world -- occupy let us stick to one point at a time. The settlers plying prominent positions in the maritime industry of our country with credit to themselves and to the land of their birth. . It is a great pity colony last year, large as they were, and he does nothing but legislate for about two-tenths that that state of things no longer exists. The Premier may look, but this is true. Now, Sir, before I go further I will say that one of the natural aspirations of New Zealand is that it should be a maritime State. It should be the you say that where we legislate we harm them. ultimate desire of the citizens that they shall participate in the maritime commerce of the right honourable gentleman is not very apposite, world, and that their manufactures shall be site in his remarks. distributed to every port, carried by New Zealand bottoms, manned and controlled by its must have dulled the honourable gentleman's native-born. Now, furthermore, with regard comprehension. to the industrial culture of the country, does is sound sense. I am not talking for talking's not the Premier remember that last session we voted a large sum of money for technical sake. but to draw honourable members' attention to what is springing up by legislation for a There is nothing more important that we can certain section of the community at the sacrifice of another : not but what I wish the people foster than technical education ; and of that sum which we voted last year the bulk of it is in the cities to get the highest possible rate of contributed by the settlers of New Zealand, or wages, but as the result of natural influences. the toilers on the soil. And the Premier knows muneration ; but I believe above all things in right well that from the North Cape to the liberty- - in individual freedom. I want to place Bluff not a single settler's son will receive one farthing of benefit from it, and that possibly the young people of the colony breast to breast, and I do not want the people in the country- not one of them will be allowed to learn a the toiling settlers, who have to work long hours trade as the result of our legislation. Talk about fostering the industries of the colony from which they cannot get any immunity or relief -- to be subject to the plundering or unjust when you have brought in regulations enabling regulations imposed by unions in the cities. It Judges of the Supreme Court-right and left is not that the working-men in the cities are throughout the colony -to decide that not more getting any special advantage, but you cannot than one boy to every three or four journeymen shall be taught a trade. Who ever gave a go into a shop and ask to buy anything that has been produced for the settlers by the towns community the right to prohibit against its but what you find that far more is placed upon own children the industries of the common- them as the charge of the middleman than wealth ? Whoever, I ask, gave them such a they are entitled to make, by reason of the in- right ? It is tyrannical in the extreme. It is creased rate of wages which is presumed to be illiberal in the extreme. Mr. Laurensen has consequent upon the unions, and the buyer makes complained of the shrinkage of our birth-rate. remark. What is the answer ? "Oh, there is Why should he complain when, Sir, we tolerate the union." By this system of legislating for

such a regulation as this, that is inflicting an indignity on motherhood ? This principle should guide the State : that its youth should have the opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of any industrial pursuit for which they may have a bent. We are quickening their natures by our national system of education, and as soon as they become old enough to acquire a profession which they may practise for the remainder of their lives we say to them, " You cannot have this or that, but you must take something else, or more probably nothing at all " A remark has been made by the Premier that the feeling through which the best settlers of this country are uniting for the promotion of their farming interests is but a revival of the National Association. It is a revival of common-sense. protection which is innate in our natures. It is in harmony with that spirit of self-preservation which caused us to send our contingents to the assistance of the Mother-country in her struggle in the Transvaal. An Hon. MEMBER. - Free-trade in Native lands. Mr. MONK. -- I can answer the honourable gentleman's interjection on that subject, but have provided the Premier with nine-tenths of the exports which left the of the productions of New Zealand. Mr. SEDDON .- According to your arguments the others are better off by being left alone ; Mr. MONK .- I do not quite understand ; the Mr. SEDDON .- I am afraid this early rising Mr. MONK .-- I know that what I am saying I believe in a high rate of wages in ample re-

<page>336</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=364></url>

a certain section of the community you are liable to injure not only those you desire to help, but also those with whom you have no concern. Now, the statement has been made in the House in connection with a question which last year I put to the Premier : Why does he not introduce legislation by which we could regulate the price of the commodities produced by the settlers? If the Government of the day are going to coddle up all the city industries, let them also take up the farming community, and say, " We will become your factors ; we will take all your produce at a fair price for the hours you have to work, and we will export all that is over and above what is required for local consumption and send it to the Old Country ; we will determine a price which will adequately remunerate the farmer for his extra-long hours of toil, and, if there is any loss, take it out of the consolidated revenue." And let them further say, in regard to the local consumption-the produce that the city people have to use, " We will stand at the gates with an arbitrary system, and fix the price which they must pay for whatever they use." That will only be fair; it will only be just and consistent with the laws I am remarking on. I know my time is limited. I only want to enunciate a few ideas for honourable members to reflect upon, and I know in their hearts they must feel that all I am claiming is perfectly just. Do not let them imagine that because they have arbitrary control of the legislation of this House, and, the settlers in the colony having only some fifteen or sixteen representatives here, they are going to ride over them. Remember that though you are numerically in the majority, and though the hours of settlers are long and toilsome, and they are more inclined to sleep than, like the city folks, to take use#cc-zero to pipes and long beers and discuss matters of legislation-I say with all respect, but it is too true, that you have throughout the colony infesting all these cities a crowd of agitators who are quite indifferent to the liberties and the welfare of a large portion of the community so long as they can secure remunerative agitation. Let the Premier talk as he may about one class being set against another ; he is specially a transgressor in this respect, and nothing is more ignoble than that attempt to set one class against another. Nothing is further from the wishes and thoughts of a statesman than that one class should be set against the other ; but if you pass continuously this class legislation, as you are doing year after year, then the Premier must know that the love of life and those instincts of self-preservation will cause the country to rise from one end to the other outside the cities for their own protection, and, in spite of your laws, you will find that the time will come that a wave of revulsion will sweep over the country that not even the Premier, with all his command of the Treasury which he controls, and his ability to continually bestow offices all round to men who lean to his

opinions-notwithstanding all this, I say that the large outlying population will yet successfully assert their rights in this country. Mr. HERRIES (Bay of Plenty). - The Premier said that this Bill was merely a technical one, but, Sir, when the Premier says a Bill is a technical one we generally look very closely into its provisions, and I say I am not satisfied with his explanation with regard to the insertion of trade-unions. I have been looking up the Trade Union Act, and I fail to see why the trade-unions should be inserted in this Bill. Mr. SEDDON .- You have not been watching the proceedings of the Court or you would know the reason why. Mr. HERRIES .- I am trying to get an explanation which the Premier did not furnish in introducing the Bill ; but I gather from what I can make out that the intention of the Industrial Arbitration and Conciliation Act was that there should be two parties in any dispute- that there should be the industrial union and the employer. Now it seems that we are going to put in a third party. Mr. TANNER .- We had trade-unions in the previous Act. Mr. HERRIES .- Yes ; but I understand that the object of the Act passed last session was to make the trade-unions come in as industrial unions, which would simplify the matters extremely ; and now we are not going to do that. but we are going to start and make a third party. I want to know the object. Is it because the trade-unions wish to avoid the registration as industrial unions? Is it because the provisions of the clause that applies to the registration of industrial unions makes them disclose facts with regard to their assets and numbers, and lays down regulations for rules, and generally is more strict in its provision than the Trade Union Act? It seems to me that there is a possible explanation that way ; but I should very much like to hear from the members of the House representing labour what object the trade-unions have in wanting to be put in as a third party in this Amendment Act. Mr. SEDDON .- They do not want it : it is to bring them in so as to bring them before the Court. Mr. HERRIES .- Well, they can come in There is provision in the Act of last now. session that they can register as industrial unions, and why is it that they do not register ? An Hon. MEMBER .- They can, but they will not. Mr. HERRIES .- Why will they not ? Why should we not say. " If you want to obtain the benefits of the Arbitration Act you must register as an industrial union." I do not know whether I am correct, but my impression is that there are certain provisions regarding registration that they do not like to comply with, and they would rather be under the Trade Union Act, which is not so stringent as the Industrial Conciliation Act. I do think an explanation is due to the House as to why these trade-unions should be put in as a third party, because, if you start to put in other people, we shall probably need an Amendment Bill to put in other bodies. I say that, as the general principle of the Bill has been approved. there shall always be two parties to a dispute, and that the whole dispute should

<page>337</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=365></url>

be conducted under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Now we shall have to consider the Trade Union Act, as a trades-union will be quite a separate party to an industrial union. With regard to the other portions of the Bill. I may say I think that clauses 3 and 5 are entirely contradictory. You compel a company which is registered outside the colony to appoint an attorney, and yet you say that that attorney, after he is appointed, cannot appear before the Court if he happens to be a legal gentleman. As the Premier said, the legal profession will, no doubt, get over it. The company will probably give the attorney a few shares, and he will be called a principal-the lawyers are bound to get there all the same. With regard to the provision for putting a stop to the dismissing of men, I quite agree with that proposal. I think, if we are going to have a Conciliation and Arbitration Act, there should be stringent measures to prevent either the men striking or the employers locking out the men while the dispute is on. So far as I know, I think that the action of the Waihi management was generally condemned as an error of judgment by all employers; and the fact of their taking the men on again is an admission that they made a mistake. I quite agree that legislation should be provided to prevent that, and also to prevent the men striking as well. I do trust the Premier will explain, when replying, why trade-unions should be made third parties, and why

they should not be compelled under the principal Act to register as industrial unions, and why we are asked under this Bill to insert them in some clauses and not in others. Mr. ELL (Christchurch City) .- The honour- able member for Waitemata complained that the young girls in the colony would not get occupation if this proposed legislation was passed. Mr. MONK .- I never mentioned young girls. Mr. ELL .-- Well. young women and young persons. Mr. MONK. - I did not say that either. Mr. ELL .- Well, the youth of the colony- that covers both sexes ; and with regard to that I wish to ask the honourable gentleman this question : How is it that there is such a scar- city of domestic help in the country if there is such a disinclination to make room for any work in the industries of the colony for young people ? So far as the young people are con- corned. they are not injured in any way by the labour legislation. Their position is un- doubtedly much better than ever it was before. I may say I have the honour of being the president of one union which has about three hundred and forty members, chiefly women and girls. They are well-conducted, they are well- dressed. bright, and intelligent girls, and their position, to my personal knowledge, has been con- siderably improved through the effect of the In- dustrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and the number that is being employed is an increasing number. It has been increasing considerably in the neighbourhood of Christchurch, and. I believe, throughout the colony. There is an abundance of work. And the result is this : With the growth of the industries we are getting now what we could not get a number of years ago-articles of local manufacture. If one will take the trouble to go through the warehouses of the cities it is astonishing to see the enor- mous stocks to be found there of highly manu- factured articles produced in this country. With regard to the price of boots and clothing. and so forth, I have to furnish my family with these articles and I know they have not gone up in price, although the wages of those who make them have gone up. Mr. MASSEY .-- Which ? Mr. ELL .-- Clothing has not gone up in price. Mr. MASSEY .-- Oh, yes, it has. Mr. ELL .- My bills tell me No. Mr. FLATMAN .- Wool has gone down. Mr. ELL .- " Wool has gone down "; but what about the previous years when wool was up? Then, with regard to furniture, nearly the whole of the furniture put into the homes of the colony is manufactured in the colony out of our own woods, and the price of furniture has gone down considerably. Nearly every article of furniture placed in the homes of the people has gone down considerably, not- withstanding the fact that the wages of those engaged in the industries have gone up con- siderably. And this industry has increased at a wonderful rate. In fact, in the Christchurch district the manufacturers have doubled the output, and one of the chief organizers of the factories assured me that they have had to send out of the country to get men, on account of the rapid increase in the development of the business which has been brought about on account of the rapid growth of the demand for colonial manufactured goods. With regard to one particular article which I might men- tion, wire-wove mattresses, as showing that our legislation has not injuriously affected the pur- chasers, I may mention that an article which cost #1 5s. 6d. a few years ago can now be bought for 18s. 9d. An Hon. MEMBER .- But very much poorer quality. Mr. ELL .- It is a very good article indeed. I have got some of them in my own house, and have had them for some years. How is it that the honourable gentleman waxes so wroth and seems to be so angry at the prospect of in- creasing the wages of those who produce the articles we have to use ? How is it that there is not a general outcry against the rise in the price of timber ? An Hon. MEMBER. - So there is. Mr. ELL .- Yes; but the rise took place be- fore the employers in the timber industry com- menced to shorten the hours and increase the wages. The rise was going on long before that. Yet directly the workpeople want to take ad- vantage of the labour legislation to improve their position there is an outcry. And what is the result ? What has the country suffered ? Our Post-Office Bank deposits show a consider- able increase during the past year. The con- dition of the working-classes has never been better, their homes have never been better

furnished, the people have never been better clothed, and they have never been more happy. There has been a certain amount of conflict with the employers, but there has been no real antagonism between the workers and those who employ the workers. The real test is this: If the labour legislation has proved detrimental, how is it that the country has been so thoroughly prosperous? It has been contended that labour legislation is going to be that is unsatisfactory to them. Now, another injury to the country. It will do nothing of the sort. The country was never in a better position than it is in now. Seeing that our labour legislation has produced such good results, it seems to me that we can go on very well, and do all we can to improve the condition of the people in the future. What we want is not a rich and leisured class in the country. We want to so arrange our economic conditions as to be under the previous Act it was found that certain to enable those who assist in producing the various classes of employees, such as tramway employees, to share in the wealth they have produced, and that is the effect which our labour legislation is having. Its effect has been to lead to a more equal distribution of the wealth produced by the people. I am very glad that this Bill has been introduced to remove some of the defects and shortcomings of the Act passed last session.

Mr. G. W. RUSSELL (Riccarton). - I do not think that it is wise that there should be a general discussion upon the labour-laws of the colony at this stage, but there are two remarks I would like to make. I am sorry to see that the Government propose to further extend facilities for the cancellation of labour unions. I am of opinion that, if the Conciliation and Arbitration Act is to remain in force, it is most desirable that as far as possible we should make our legislation so that the unions shall be bound by the award, and shall not be able to cancel their registration. I may remind the Premier, for example, that in connection with the linotype dispute in Wellington, on the award being made and proving against the unions, almost immediately in the Typographical Union in Wellington a proposal for cancellation of its registration was made, although the good-sense of the men went against it.

Mr. SEDDON. - This clause is to stop that.

Mr. G. W. RUSSELL. - I take it that the position is that, if under clause 12 of the Bill the union does not forward its papers, then it drops out of existence, and the Registrar simply sends notice that the union has ceased to exist, and its registration becomes of no effect. Turning to clause 20 of the Act of last year, there I admit that power is given by which the registration of unions can be cancelled. But what I want to point out to the honourable gentleman is that, while a union can cancel its registration after an award has been given if it is unsatisfactory to the union, the employers cannot cancel their existence. They have to accept the award, and it can be enforced against the employers, because their financial position is such that they cannot pack up their traps and go away: whilst, a union having ceased to exist, the power of the employer to deal with a breach of the award can only come about by prosecuting an individual member of the union, and I do not think there is a single employer in this colony who would wish to take the roof from over the head of an individual member of the union by prosecuting him. I want the Minister to see what I think is the effect of throwing the door open to the cancellation of the registration of unions, which might possibly take place if an award has been given.

point I would like to draw attention to is this. In connection with the definition of "worker": At a recent sitting of the Arbitration Court in Christchurch argument was brought before the Court in the hairdressers' dispute which covered a very large range of what the amended clause in last year's Act was supposed to put right. The honourable gentleman will remember that [grocers' employees, carters, and others, did not come within the provisions of the Act, on account of its being held by the Court that they were not engaged in an industry. "Industry" being used in a somewhat restricted sense as relating to production. Now, exactly the same argument was maintained before his Honour Mr. Justice Cooper in the Arbitration Court in Christchurch not many weeks ago; and Mr. Justice Cooper, while not giving a decision against counsel.

Mr. T. G. Russell. - who was appearing on behalf of the master hairdressers in Christchurch, thought the position was so open that he suggested Mr. Russell should apply to his Honour Mr. Justice Denniston, sitting in the Supreme Court, and he suggested that a writ of prohibition be applied for to

prevent the Court of Arbitration from dealing with the case. His Honour, in fact, wished the opinion of the Supreme Court to be taken as to whether the larger definition of "worker" really covered the whole of the cases it was meant to cover. I do not know whether the Government will consider it desirable to wait in connection with this Bill until the decision of that case has been given or not, but I hope whatever alteration may be necessary in the law will have the effect of finally settling this question, that all workers shall come under the provisions of this Act. For my own part, I see no reason why persons engaged in factories shall come under the Act and persons engaged as hairdressers and similar avocations should be excluded. My idea is that our labour-laws should be universal and should cover all classes of the community. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston North) .- There are one or two points I would like to draw the Premier's attention to in connection with this Bill. One is the advisability of practically including an Eight Hours Bill in this measure by making it possible for an application to the Arbitration Court to be made by, say, ten employees in any district to deal with the hours of labour in their special occupation. I think if some provision of that sort, instead of the cumbersome proceeding that has to be gone through just now, were provided, in many cases there would be a great deduction of the hours of labour worked in many of the country dis-

<page>339</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=367></url>

tricts. There is another point, but perhaps it is not so much a matter for legislation as for the administration of the Government : that is, the extraordinary industrial districts the Government have in the North Island at any rate. The whole of the Wellington and Hawke's Bay Provincial Districts are jumped together in one industrial district, and it is ridiculous to say that the conditions of labour, employment, and living in Wellington City are to be compared with the conditions in the country districts ; and yet an award for Wellington City alone might be made to apply to the whole provincial district. I think there is some lack of proper administration by the Government in allowing such unwieldy districts to exist. It ought not to be necessary to specify the matter in any Act, but some common-sense arrangement should be come to by the Government in connection with the division of the districts. Mr. LAWRY (Parnell) .-- I think, Sir, that the House and the whole country will realise that it is very desirable indeed to improve any measure that appertains to labour throughout the colony. With his youthful enthusiasm, the honourable member for Waitemata went fully into the question before the House--we have heard the same remark from the honourable gentleman on many previous occasions--and, while I listened to him, I thought that old Solomon was perfectly right when he said that there was nothing new under the sun. The honourable gentleman, as you all know, has the interests of the country settlers at heart. I believe there is no man in the community, certainly no man in this House or in any branch of the Legislature, who is more desirous of advancing the best interests of the settlers of the colony than the honourable member for Waitemata. But, Sir, the honourable gentleman fell into his usual mistake when he referred to the employment of boys in this colony. Does he not rethinks that there never was a period in the history of the colony when it was so difficult to get boy-labour as at the present time. Take the majority of the people of the colony take a common-sense of opinion on the question . . . and you would find that the majority of the parents of the colony do not want their boys to go into trados. An Hon. MEMBER .- They are all in the Railway service. Mr. LAWRY .-- You cannot get them to go even into the Railway service. An Hon. MEMBER .- You can get them by thousands. Mr. LAWRY .- The honourable member for Waihomo says, " You can get them by thousands " : but only three or four weeks ago the Minister for Railways wired to me that he wanted a boy about eighteen years of age as a porter. I scoured the whole district for one and could not get one, and wired the Minister to that effect. Yesterday I gave notice that when this Bill was in Committee I would move certain amendments. I have been consulting probably the greatest and I got a reply saying that if my 11.30. amendments were introduced into the Bill it would necessitate the entire re-casting of the

measure itself. What I want to see in dealing with these labour measures is that the men who are appointed as arbitrators should be men who understand what they are doing. What an absurdity it would be to appoint as arbitrator a man who was a tailor to deal with things agricultural, or to deal with matters relating to the putting-up of wooden structures. What I want to see is that the Trades and Labour Councils of the country should have power to appoint two to deal with their particular trade questions, that the employers who are affected by the decision should have power to appoint two, and that there should be a chairman appointed by the Government and paid by the Government, and that the unions should pay their appointees and the employers theirs, respectively. That is what I wanted : but I was told by this great legal authority that to introduce a clause of that nature would necessitate the entire recasting of the measure. Now, Sir, I would like to point out that we very frequently interfere in this House with matters about which we have no understanding whatever. If we only dealt with things that came under our own particular ken, if we confined ourselves in our criticism to matters with which we are familiar, we certainly should make fewer mistakes, and our legislation generally would be more beneficial to the country. Sir, as pointed out by the honourable member for Christchurch City (Mr. Ell), it was predicted when we introduced labour legislation in this colony disaster would inevitably follow. From the very first period of our introducing labour legislation, it was shown by Captain Russell, the defunct leader of an effete Opposition, that arbitration and conciliation were the only things to reconcile disputes between employer and employé. I have on many occasions, and I am pleased to do so now, given to the honourable member for Hawke's Bay great credit for what he has done in this particular matter. We all realise that there should be no conflict between labour and capital. We all realise to the fullest extent that they are dependent upon each other, and at the same time independent of each other, and we see that if a labourer goes out for a day's work and does his duty, he simply exchanges his labour for an equivalent in sterling cash, and there the obligation ends : it is a mistake to regard the employer as a sort of philanthropist, and the man who is employed as little better than a galley-slave. I am pleased indeed that the Premier has introduced this Bill. I take it his primary object is as far as possible to perfect the legislation. It is only when we come to questions of administration that we realise the benefits or otherwise of the measures enacted. I wish, however, instead of bringing in a separate Bill, the honourable gentleman had taken the initiative and had incorporated this with the existing Bill. It is, in my opinion, the greatest mistake in life to go

<page>340</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=368></url>

at the same time carrying on the process of | to go off either. With regard to the member consolidation. I remember once when Chairman of a Road Board that we laid it down as a principle that we would carry on work without any reference to the Act at all. Well, I was fifteen consecutive years Chairman of the Road Board, and during that time we never had a contested election or a complaint from a ratepayer. I remember on one occasion when I was Chairman of a Board two members began to dispute a particular clause. I let them go on for three-quarters of an hour, and when they asked me for my decision I said, "Well, gentlemen, I wish to inform you that that clause is repealed." Sir, I am very pleased with another matter. I was afraid it was a huge mistake to start dealing with Bills at half-past ten in the morning. One effect, however, has been to, in some degree, resuscitate the Opposition. We were privileged to hear the present leader of the Opposition, the honourable member for Waitemata, who was followed by the Right Hon. the Premier, and then came our characteristic and genial friend the member for the Bay of Plenty, with the result that there has been a debate that has, up to the present, justified in some degree the meeting at half-past ten. Mr. J. ALLEN (Bruce). - Sir, one hardly knows how to take the honourable member for Parnell-in one breath he says the Opposition is effete, in another that it is resuscitated. At any rate, whether it is effete or whether it is resuscitated, there may be a defunct leader

but there is also a defunct member . I allude to the honourable member. I quite agree with the honourable member for Riccarton with regard to clause 12, and I hope the Premier will have some amendment placed in the Bill now before us to provide against such an occurrence as this : that an industrial union under an agree- ment shall go off the register while the agree- ment is in force. That has happened. Mr. SEDDON .- It is already provided for in the Act. Mr. J. ALLEN. -- Well, I know. at any rate, a union has taken that course, and clause 12 will make it easier of accomplishment than ever before. All they will have to do under clause 12 will be to refuse to send in the return referred to in clause 17, and then, under the amending clause, that union will go off the register. I do not think it should be made easier for a union to go off the register than it is now. As a matter of fact, a union ought to be just as much compelled as the employer to remain on the register, with all the liabilities attached to it, until the end of the award. Mr. SEDDON .-- So it is. Mr. J. ALLEN .- No, it is not. I know of an instance in which it was not so -- an instance in which a union went off the register while the award was still running. Mr. SEDDON .- It is still continued by law. Mr. J. ALLEN .- Yes. that may be. At any rate, I say a union has no right to go off while an award is running, and that ought to be made distinct in the Bill. An employer cannot go off, and no opportunity should be given to the union for Parnell-I am sorry he is away-I go back in spirit, Sir, to last Wednesday fortnight, when the honourable member was addressing his constituents at Parnell, and I recollect reading- perhaps only a short account -in our papers a very strong speech the honourable member made with regard to labour legislation. Mr. PIRANI .- He warned the Government. Mr. J. ALLEN. - Yes, he warned the Govern- ment that if they continued this kind of legis- lation they were bringing a scourge on their backs that they would not be able to bear. H. said, "We have had enough of this labour legislation." He was of another opinion then. He also said, "We must ease the burdens placed on the employers, and make things better for the farming community, and do some- thing for the workers on the land." He also remarked that these Acts were doing injuries. and these injuries would have to be rectified. Yet he comes here and gives a speech in which he sings a different song altogether. I do not know whether it is the effect of the place or not. I suppose it is. With regard to one other point in the Bill, I wish to say that I think the Hon. the Premier, in his second- reading speech, ought to have made it more plain to the House what is intended in inserting the word " trade-union " in the Bill. It is quite true the word was in the Act of 1894. It is also true that it is not in the Act of 1900. and therefore we may assume there were some good and sufficient reasons for taking it out. I have looked through Hansard, and gone through the Premier's speech on the Bill of 1900, to find out why the word "trade-union-" was taken out, but I can find no reference what- ever to that point. Now, the right honourable gentleman did not in his speech to-day explain why these words were put back again. . and I think it is only fair that he should have done I understand, Sir, from a casual remark so. made across the table, that his object is to place the trade-unions in the same position as the industrial unions are in under the Act - that is, that they may be registered under the Act and made liable to the provisions of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Well, Sir, I do not know why they should not come under the Act as industrial unions. why they should not be registered as industrial unions, and it has to be explained why they a trade unions are to be allowed privileges .- - if they are privileges, under this Act,-and why they are not compelled to register as industrial unions. I can see one possible reason why they should not be allowed to come under that Act as trade-unions. I am not at all sure if they do that they will come under the direction the Court has made as to membership. Industrial union- have certain directions given to them from the Court with respect to conditions of membership. That is to say, instead of being a close corpora- tion as some of the trade-unions were. they must be open to all workers upon the payment of a very small fee. Now, if the rules of the trade- nions are not rules which will be in accord with that direction of the Court --

<page>341</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=369></url>

Mr. TANNER .- They must be in accordance with law. Mr. J. ALLEN .- Very well ; and what does the law say? The law with regard to trade- unions is different from the law with regard to industrial unions, as honourable members must know. The law of these trade - unions says that any person under the age of twenty-one and above the age of sixteen may be a member of a trade-union, unless-and I ask the honourable gentleman to mark this . provision for the same is made in the rules thereof. What does that mean ? Mr. TANNER .- That was altered in 1896 by special Act. Mr. J. ALLEN. - By the Trades Union Act ? Mr. TANNER .- Yes. Mr. J. ALLEN .- If that is so, I beg the honourable gentleman's pardon. But I do not think it is so. Under this clause it has not been altered, and I know that in former days trade- unions imposed certain penalties upon those it is joining with respect to entrance-fees. doubtful, unless care is taken to provide for it, whether trade-unions would be subject to the award and direction of the Court in regard to the entrance-fees which are now being imposed with respect to industrial unions. Then, the Premier will most certainly have to include under this Act another clause which he has omitted. He has given trade-unions all the benefits under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, but he omitted one very important clause. He omitted altogether the penalty clause, and trade-unions are to receive all the benefits but do not come under the penalty clause of the Act of 1900. Now, that is absurd. I have no doubt it is an oversight, and will be rectified when the Bill is in Committee ; but it is only right that attention should be drawn to it, so that when the Bill is in Committee the Premier may make provision to apply the penalties to the trade-unions. Mr. ATKINSON (Wellington City) .- I have been puzzled, like the honourable member for Bruce, with regard to the insertion of the word " trade-unions " in certain sections only of the Act we passed last session. The Right Hon. the Premier gave no explanation at all of the matter. Mr. SEDDON .- Yes, I did. Mr. ATKINSON .- Well, at any rate, he passed the matter over very lightly, and I did not gather the purport of what he said. But from what he has said since I understand it is on account of a decision of the Arbitration Court, which had ruled that certain trade- unions which were not directly engaged in any industrial pursuit were unable to register as industrial unions under the Act. Mr. SEDDON .- I will tell you what I said. I said that, whilst an award would bind an industrial union, a trade-union which had failed to join an industrial union could not be brought under the law or be subject to the award, the intention being to bring trade-unions under the same provisions and the same penalties as you would the industrial unions. Mr. ATKINSON .- If that is the right honourable gentleman's idea, the last remark of the honourable member for Bruce is a very complete and conclusive answer to him. The word "trade-union " is inserted in a certain number of the sections of the original Act, one section being taken and another left in the most arbitrary fashion, and if the right honourable gentleman now says the main object is not that they should get the benefits of the Act, but be subject to the penalties of the Act if they do not register- Mr. SEDDON .- I say trade-unions are not liable to the award unless they form part of an industrial union. Mr. ATKINSON .-- Yes : and you said this was to make them subject to the penalties in the Act. The honourable member for Bruce referred to section 94, which contains a provision for the enforcement of an award. Now, the Bill inserts the words "trade-union or " in section 24, and therefore makes the provisions of section 94 with regard to the enforcement of an award applicable to any trade-union that is a party to an industrial agreement. A trade- union, therefore, which is a party to an industrial agreement becomes liable with regard to its obligations under that agreement to the provisions of section 94. But supposing a trade- union is not a party to an industrial agreement, it is not then subject to the liabilities imposed by section 94. Why is it that the Right Hon. the Premier has omitted altogether from his Bill any amendment which would add the word " trade-union " to section 94? Subsection (6) is the section best worth quoting :- " All property belonging to the judgment debtor (including therein, in the case of an industrial union or industrial association, all property held by trustees for the judgment debtor) shall be available in or towards satisfaction of the judgment debt, and if the judgment debtor is an industrial union or an industrial association, and its property is insufficient to

fully satisfy the judgment debt, its members shall be liable for the deficiency." It is perfectly clear from the fact that "trade union" is not inserted before "industrial union" in the same way as proposed by the Bill to be inserted in section 34—the trade-unions will be exempt from the enforcement of the provisions of this section, both as regards the property of the union and as regards the individual liability of members. So that the only sanction for the award of the Court given under this Act would be omitted from the powers that the Court will have in regard to trade-unions. Now, it is perfectly clear, from the Premier's explanation to me a few minutes ago, that he had not contemplated that for a moment, and that his draftsman must have inadvertently omitted to insert the word "trade-union" in section 94, subsection (6), which is really the most important place for it to have gone in according to the Right Hon. the Premier's own argument. Because if there are recalcitrant trade-unions, if there are unions who are reluctant to register under the Act, it is quite clear that they can evade any liability at all under the Act by refusing to be

<page>342</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=370></url>

a party to an industrial agreement. This Bill imposes liability upon any trade-union which has come under an industrial agreement, but if it has refused to register as an industrial union, then, in opposition to the aim of the Premier, the union will still evade any liability under the Act. I will just cite a few other sections in order to show how haphazard the drafting has been. Section 24, as I said, is already amended by the insertion of the words "trade-union or," but take an adjoining section which is dealing with the same general subject of industrial agreements. Section 27 says,—"Every industrial agreement duly made, executed, and filed shall be binding on the parties thereto, and also on every member of any industrial union or industrial association which is party thereto." Now, a trade-union has been inserted as a possible party to an industrial agreement under the provisions of clause 4; but the personal liability of the members of industrial unions which is imposed by section 27 is not imposed on trade-unions, because the words have not been added thereto. There is another case which shows that the honourable gentleman's proposal to make the trade-unions subject to the same liability as the industrial unions is not being effectively carried out by the Bill we have before us. Take section 42, subsection (4), of the principal Act, which says that a chairman or a member of a Conciliation Board is to be disqualified "if he is proved to be guilty of inciting any industrial union or employer to commit any breach of an industrial agreement or award." Then, Sir, it is perfectly clear the word "trade - union" should be inserted there, for a trade-union by this Bill is enabled to be a party to any industrial agreement just as much as an industrial union registered under the Act. Of course, that raises a general question of principle, on which I have before differed from the Premier. I refer to the great danger of attempting an exhaustive enumeration of cases. In order to be quite certain what we are doing by this kind of amendment, the only safe plan would be to go microscopically through every section and line of the principal Act where the words "industrial union" and "industrial association" occur and insert the word "trade-union." It is perfectly certain that has not been done. Now, there is another way in which it could be done, and that is this: by amending the interpretation clause. That, of course, is scientific and comprehensive, and must meet every possible case. Sir, I have been looking so far upon the obligations imposed on trade unions by the Bill, and the obligations which the Premier said he desired should be imposed, but now I will take the privileges which the Act confers. The important privilege of moving the Court is conferred by section 52 of the principal Act, which says: "Any industrial dispute may be referred for settlement to a Board by application in that behalf made by any party thereto." Now, an industrial dispute is defined in the interpretation clause of the Act to mean "he is making, and they have a right to go to" any dispute arising between one or more | him and ask for an increase, and, in the event" employers, or industrial unions or associations of employers, and one or more industrial unions or associations of workers, in relation to industrial matters." From this clause trade-unions have been excluded by the Arbitration Court, and, of course, the reason why the Bill

is introduced, or this particular amendment is introduced, is because they have been so excluded. They are expressly now included in the provisions relating to industrial agreements, so if they choose they can get the advantage and liability of an industrial agreement. But, assuming that they are not parties to any industrial agreement, then in the case of an industrial dispute the trade-union may incur liabilities in the event of the Court making an award, yet they will have no right of initiating proceedings nor any locus standi in the Court. Well, I am quite certain that neither friend nor foe of the legislation contained in this Bill could desire to see this matter treated in this piecemeal and haphazard fashion. I would suggest, therefore, to the Right Hon. the Premier that the Bill should be thoroughly overhauled. I am sure this House is not the proper body to undertake the task. Mr. SEDDON. - It is my intention to refer the Bill to the Labour Bills Committee. Mr. ATKINSON. - I was going to suggest something of the sort. I hardly dare to propose to refer it to the Committee of lawver - which was somewhat severely handled the other day. But if this Bill is not to be overhauled by some Committee there will be a chance of something like hopeless confusion, which I fear the matter would be phlegmed into if these curiously selected amendments are put through without the matter being comprehensively dealt with. My honourable friend has asked me what would be the position of a trade-union, assuming they were fully subject to the Act. Well, it seems to me that if that were so, under subsection (6) of section 94 of the Act the whole of the property and trust funds of the union would be liable under that section, and the individual property of the members would also be liable, to satisfy the judgment. I do not know whether in consequence it could be regarded as too drastic. I do not suppose it would, because trade-unions registered under the Act are already fully subject to it. However, that and other difficulties which have been pointed out in this debate would form a very proper subject for consideration on the part of the Labour Bills Committee. Mr. BOLLARD (Eden). -- When the 12.0. Conciliation and Arbitration Act was first introduced I understood it was brought in for the purpose of settling disputes between employers and employees. I quite approve of that. I am also in favour of trade unions. I believe that any body of workers working in any industry have a right to get a fair share of the profits of that industry, and they have a right to band themselves together to get higher wages if they are of opinion that the employer is not giving them a fair rate according to the profit

<page>343</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=371></url>

of a dispute, they have a right to apply under do not know that I should have risen except to the Act to have the dispute settled. So far so : refer to the question of farmers' unions. If we good ; but what do we find ? We find that paid . are not going to do away with freedom of con- agitators are using the Act for the purpose of causing disputes between employers and employees. Take the Waihi Mine, for instance. There the men were quite satisfied with their in another form of the National Association as wages and hours until certain agitators told them that they ought to get more wages and have shorter hours. Probably, so far as that great and wealthy mine is concerned, and ! considering the large amount it is paying in dividends, the demands might be justified, but beyond that the award will be made to apply to the whole of the Thames Goldfield, and the result will be that in the case of many other mines they will not be able to carry ; because if you fix the price of labour, why not on under the increased rates. After an Act has been placed on the statute-book we know I also fix the price of produce-at any rate, as sold whether it is a good Act or not by the working in the colony? Now, the Premier seems to of it. Take, for instance, the opinion of Mr. ; think I am not serious in this matter; but I ' can assure the Premier that, if there is no Justice Cooper as to employers being obliged to place their books in the hands of unions to be examined by them. I say that was simply monstrous. An Hon. MEMBER. - Mr. Justice Cooper did not say that-he said the Court should see the country. Just now, I admit, there is a wave of prosperity going over the colony. Not that the honks. Mr. BOLLARD. - If that is so, then he has , Government can take any credit for it; it is backed down, and I am very glad to hear it. I caused by the force of circumstances-caused I think,

however, we should alter the name of this Act and call it the Industrial Agitation and Irritation Act. The honourable member for Christchurch City stated that certain manufacturers in Christchurch were sending out of the colony and importing skilled labour. That is just what this side of the House predicted. A number of troops are withdrawn from South Africa a few years ago would occur as the result of the probability is that the public the legislation regulating the employment of a creditor will then find that we have borrowed enough money. At all events, the Premier certain number of boys to a workman. We predicted that skilled labour would have to be ' does not care to go upon the English market imported and that the boys would not get employment. What is the consequence? We farmers will make themselves felt. That will have thousands of boys applying to get into the Railway service and other branches of : be the time when the people will begin to the Civil Service in order that they may make a living. I do not want to see manufacturers in no doubt about it, there are indications just factories stuffed with boys in the way they have been, but I would like to see the boys . now that the tide is turning. One is sorry of the colony get a fair show to learn trades. : to see it, but we cannot shut our eyes to the I consider the boys should not be kept out, as fact. Meat is going down in price. The in- the boys would be able. when they grow up, to : creased price of meat, which was caused by the take the places of the men when they are knocked out. Then, with regard to the action of the Shipping and Seamen's Act, what do we find? We find foreign seamen on almost all our ships, whilst boys are not allowed to learn " mand in South Africa ceases? We ought to to be seamen. Now, I was very much surprised to hear the statements made by the honourable member for Parnell in his speech to-day, because I hold in my hand the report of a speech delivered by him to his constituents at Parnell shortly before the session. He said, " One of the great problems of the age was how to deal with the labour question, but at the same time it seemed to him that labour was i assure this House that the farmers will rise like running mad." That is what the honourable . one man, and they are the largest section of the member said. How does that statement compare with what he has just said? Now, Sir, I tract, why should not this Act be made to apply to farmers' unions? The farmers, I may tell the Premier, are banding together now-not the Premier supposes, but men of all shades of political opinion. I therefore intend to move that farmers' unions be included when this Bill is in Committee. An Hon. MEMBER .- Will the Premier accept farmers' unions ? Mr. SEDDON. - I accept anything that is good. Mr. BOLLARD .- I do not see why farmers' unions or any other unions should be left out, amendment in the Act in the direction I have suggested, he will shortly find that the farmers are determined upon having some alteration with regard to the price of produce in this by the war in South Africa. It is caused by the extravagant expenditure of a million of money every year-borrowed money too. It is caused by the separator and the freezing of meat. There are indications now that the time of prosperity is changing, and when the large for money now. We may have a time of adversity, and that will be the time when the consider their position with regard to the price of labour and the price of produce. There is war in some measure, compensated the farmers of the country for the loss in the price of wool ; but we now find that meat is going down : and what will be the price of oats when the de- be careful and to look ahead, and not go too fast with those indications looming in the distance. Now, Sir, as I have said before, something ought to be done for the farmers. We had a Bill before the House last night-I do not wish further to refer to it than to say that it was to fix the price of labour to farmers, and to restrict the hours of labour. I can we cannot live without them. They will rise as

<page>344</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=372></url>

one man, and bring the Premier to his knees in this matter unless he is keen enough to see what will happen, and they will make themselves a power. The Premier has been warned before, and I warn him again, that he will find them such a power as will compel justice to be done to them. Mr. PALMER (Ohinemuri) .- Sir, after the warnings the Premier has received from the honourable member for

Waitemata and the honourable member for Eden the best thing he can do is to go down on his knees in fear and trembling. But he has had warnings before, and yet has the Hon. the Premier been brought to his knees ? No. Has the country been ruined ? Not a bit. There is the same old cry : the same old Tory speeches that have been delivered time after time in this House, and we are getting extremely tired of them. I wish these honourable gentlemen, next time they speak, would introduce something new -something fresh-and give us some change from the old ideas. And, in regard to the statement about the Waihi Mine, why did not the honour- able gentleman, the member for Eden, go and learn something about it before he came here to give us his version, which is absolutely and wholly incorrect. The statement that he made is that the Waihi miners were satisfied with the wages they were getting until agitators went amongst them. Now, that statement is without the slightest foundation in fact. There has been for the last three years there an agitation among the miners themselves for a rise in the price of wages, and the men said they were underpaid. It was not the agitators at all who did this, but the miners, and they voted as a whole on the question as to whether they would go to the Conciliation Board or whether they would not. It was decided by an overwhelming majority to ask for an increase in wages, and later on it was also resolved by an overwhelming majority to go to the Conciliation Board. An Hon. MEMBER .- They were satisfied. Mr. PALMER. - The men who said they were satisfied were called by the employers. Of course, you will get blacklegs in every union, and you will get men to come forward and say what they are told to say. If they do not do so, what is the consequence? What has been the consequence to some of the men who came boldly forward and said they were dissatisfied, and that they were not fairly treated ? They were left at the mercy of the manager, and nothing was said about reinstating them. Why, the witnesses who gave evidence have also been dismissed from their employment. Would any one wonder, then, that men who have wives and families to keep should come forward when they were called by the employers and say that they were satisfied ? They had to stretch their con- sciences when their situations were in jeopardy. An Hon. MEMBER. -- You cannot believe them. Mr. PALMER. -- Well, at any rate, the posi- tion was this: When they asked for that increase they had a Supreme Court judgment before them -the judgment of Mr. Justice Edwards on the West Coast-which had fixed the scale of the wages of miners at 25 per cent. above what they had been getting for years in that district. They said, " Why should the miners down there get those wages? If they are entitled to them there, then we are entitled to them here." But, in case the employers should not be satisfied. they actually went and fixed the scale they asked from the employers at from 10 to 15 per cent. lower than the actual judgment of Mr. Justice Edwards. Well, that was done and submitted to the employers, and it was asked, " Will you look and see whether you can give us this scale of pay, which is 15 per cent. below what Mr. Justice Edwards fixed in the Arbitra- tion Court ? ~ The result of the application was that every one of the officers of the Miners' Union was dismissed. The officers were singled out, and the general manager of the mine dare not say it was not simply because they asked, " Will you consider this question of an increase ? " Now, this Bill, I say, goes in the right direction when it says, "We will not let you ' sack ' a man simply because he asks you to look into a scale of increased wages the men wish to lay before you before resorting to the Conciliation Board." If they were allowed to dismiss men in that manner, then good-bye to the Conciliation Act. What person would take a position in the Miners' Union, or in any union, as secretary, treasurer, or committee- man, or any other position, if, whenever they were to go to the employers to submit a scale of wages to them they were to be dismissed? Then, who would take these positions ? It would mean that the men would have to employ paid secretaries and paid officers outside their own union, and these people would not care what demands they made. Mr. TANNER .- They would be called agi- tators. Mr. PALMER .- Yes, they would be called agitators, and they might be properly so called. At present these officers are members in the union, and feel that the responsibility is on their own shoulders, and therefore there is, as it were, a brake on them. They will only ask what is fair, and they will not go too far in their demands. That

being the position. Sir. I consider that the honourable member should have been careful before he made the statement he did about the matter of the Waibi Mine, for when the whole of the facts are looked into the case certainly does not look well for the employers. I would like to explain that all the companies are not concerned -- only the Waihi Company. The other companies were willing to deal fairly and justly with the men. An Hon. MEMBER .- The Waihi is the richest company in the north. Mr. PALMER .- Yes; the richest in New Zealand. An Hon. MEMBER. - That is always the way. An Hon. MEMBER .- But it applied to all the mines on the peninsula, rich and poor alike. as well as the Waihi. Mr. PALMER. - The honourable gentleman's objection is that the men applied for the Conciliation Board to award for all the mines in the district. But who did this ? Was it the men? Why, they cited the Waihi Mine, but when the

<page>345</page>
<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=373></url>

case was called on before the Board the Waihi mine-owners were the ones to get all the mines in the peninsula made parties also. The Waihi Mine did this to keep the wages down, as thereby the small companies, which were not paying, would be put upon just the same footing as the Waihi Company. All these companies were forced in. and they met the Waihi Company and fought with them as one man : but many of them wanted to deal fairly with their men. They would not have done what the Waihi Company did in dismissing the officers of the union from their employment. Not only had the Waihi Company gone in for dismissing those officers of the union whom it employed, but they were crushing out, as they said they would, the trade-union altogether, and wanted to go back to the old system of strikes and lock-outs. Sir, the honourable member for Eden has raised the old cry that this is going to frighten away capital. It is just the same old cry that we have had year after year that is raised to-day. When the wages of the miners were fixed on the West Coast, did it frighten away capital there? No. We have had a boom there since the wages were fixed by Mr. Justice Edwards's judgment. Yet always we hear the same cry about frightening away capital and closing up mines that some honourable gentlemen have made use of to-day. Another statement that is made is that employers have to place their books before the unions. Now, Sir, the books go before the Court ; and when the employers on this occasion, in this matter of the Waihi dispute, had a subject of controversy. when there was a denial between one party and the other and their books would prove which side was right-they refused to produce their books for a long time. The Court assured them that the miners would not see the books, and the Court only would look into them, and as a result they were brought to the Court, and taken away quickly as soon as the Court had done with them. There was no possibility of the miners looking into them. An Hon. MEMBER .- No harm in that. Mr. PALMER .- There is no harm in that, of course. Mr. R. THOMPSON. - Did the union not apply for the books ? Mr. PALMER .- The union wanted to look at the books to see if a certain statement was correct, because there was a denial on one side and an assertion on the other side. It was a question of "time," and they wanted the " time-books," and the representatives of the company would not let them even look at the time - books. Now, Sir, with regard to the other sections of this Bill, of course these amendments had to be brought in, or else this dismissal of men because they were officers of a union would be an absolute defiance of the Act, and an end to the labour-laws of the colony. If men are going to be "sacked " because they belong to unions, and these companies are going to crush out the unions, then there is no possibility of industrial conciliation in this colony. Another thing that I wish to mention is that they appointed a lawyer as attorney for the English companies to appear before the Court. I think this principle is wrong. If it is a principle of the law that we are not going to have lawyers in the Court, why should one person have them and another not ? I go further, and say if an English company wants to appoint a lawyer as attorney, well, let them appoint him as attorney, but if they are going to appear in the Court, then that lawyer should have the privilege of appointing some one to appear for him, such appointee not to be a lawyer. This Bill should be amended to give the lawyer that privilege, so that his company shall be

represented before the Board or Court. Mr. MILLAR (Dunedin City) .-- Mr. Speaker, two or three honourable members whom I have heard speaking on this Bill have been strongly advising the Government to go slow, and saying it is in the interests of the country they should go slow. Now, Sir, I do not think the labour party want to push things unjustly. But if any honourable member thinks that the labour party are going to stand still, or that the labour movement has not come to stay in this colony. he is making one of the greatest mistakes that could be committed. It is going to stay, not only here, but will be extended to every one of the Australian Colonies; and they intend to ask this House to see justice done to them and nothing more. The honourable member for Eden told us just now that the farmers would rise in their wrath and hurl the Government out of the country. When a bogey like this is raised one wants to analyse it. We have so often heard of the immense power of the farmers that I took the trouble to go through the census returns to find out its value. The total return of farmers in the country is thirty thousand, and the whole of those engaged in agricultural and pastoral pursuits, including agricultural labourers, amount to seventy-one thousand out of a total population of seven hundred and fifty thousand. The farmers in 1895 had a block vote of thirty thousand ; probably there will be a slight increase this year, but there will be a corresponding increase on the other side as well. To take the Act as it stands, I do not think the Government could have gone much slower: there is no forward movement in this Bill with the exception of the one thing the member for Ohinemuri has pointed out-that where a dispute arises, and a union has gone first to the employers and asked to have a conference on matters affecting the two-before ever the case has gone to the Board or the Court men have been dismissed. They could not dismiss them after the case had gone to the Board-after the dispute was filed ; but they took the opportunity before it got that length of dismissing the men. This Bill only makes provision that where there is anything in dispute, or anything is commenced between the two sides, everything shall remain in statu quo until it is entirely decided. That cannot injure either one side or the other. If you take this from the Bill there is not one forward movement from the first clause to the last. The other part deals merely with little defects existing in the Act. It means that as

<page>346</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=374></url>

soon as a union has entered into a discussion | place a man there with good common-sense with the employer- Mr. J. ALLEN .- It may not enter into a discussion. Mr. MILLAR .- Well, I will tell you what takes place, that which goes on at the present time, and I should advise-if we are to take the Waihi dispute as an example-I would say to every trade-union, " Never go near your employer at all till the award is given, and then no man can be ' sacked.'" I do not think the honourable member would say that is right, or is likely to engender a right feeling between employer and employed. Is it not far better for the two to meet before they go near the Court ? That is what we are trying to do. Hitherto where this has been done the men have been dismissed before they ever took a formal part, and that is what we are trying to avoid, and to say that from the first approach on the part of either employer or employed till the matter is finally settled no man shall be dismissed on account of any dispute. That is all there is in the whole Bill. I have heard some honourable member saying that this Bill has . created disputes. Honourable members jump to this conclusion, because they see day after day from one part of the colony to the other certain disputes before the Conciliation Board, and they therefore conclude that disputes have increased. What is the real truth ? Under this Act men have been able to organize who formerly dare not organize. They have taken advantage of the Act and organized, and before they can get any settlement with their employers they have first to take the matter to the Board and get an agreement entered up. It is simply the new unions which have been formed from day to day all over the colony in trades that never organized before which come before the Board for a settlement. Will honourable members pick out for me how many cases have been before the Court from labour-unions who entered into combination three or four

years ago? They will find they have been 12.30. very few. There have been many cases in which there have been breaches of the award, and I am sorry to say that there are some employers who are doing their best to foster a feeling against the Act throughout the colony. They are very few, I admit, but there are two or three who, at the instigation of one or two lawyers, are trying to prejudice this Act in the eyes of the people : but it will be long before the people see its disadvantages. It is now quoted all over the world that we have been able by means of this Act to settle our differences without any trouble, and I certainly think we ought not to do anything that will in any shape or form prejudice or injure the working of the Act. It may from time to time be found necessary to amend it. and the point raised by the honourable member for Parnell may have to be considered, although personally I do not confess it, because my objection is this : that should experts be appointed for every dispute, you would have a bitter party feeling imported into the matter, and you might just as well leave it to the Judge alone. If you who can analyse arguments brought before him, you would have a better chance of getting a fair decision than by having an expert, because these men, if they require assistance, have the power to call in experts in every variety of trade, and any one trade can therefore have the advantage of expert knowledge, and you would then have a man who has no strong feelings in regard to any particular matter that came before him, and the judgment would not be that of a man who is a strong partisan on one side or the other. I think the member for Waitemata made some reference to the shipping laws of this country, and I think, if I understood rightly what he said, he blamed our shipping laws for being the cause of our vessels being manned by foreigners. An Hon. MEMBER .- The member for Eden. Mr. MILLAR .- I did not hear the member for Eden state that. But if the honourable gentleman wishes to find out how the English mercantile marine stood, let him read Brassey of 1884,-which was long before there were any shipping laws in this country as to manning of ships,- and he will there find that about 75 per cent. of the British mercantile marine was manned by foreigners at that time : and I guarantee this : that in New Zealand at the present time you will find a larger percentage of British-born subjects following the sea than you will find in any part of Australasia or other British colonies, because under our laws here, and under the wage paid here and in Australia - which is a fair wage-men will go to sea. and, to-morrow, if you like to offer sufficient inducement in the matter of pay to our colonial youths you will find that they will take to the sea ; but no young colonial will go to sea under the conditions existing at the present time. They can do a great deal better by remaining ashore under present circumstances than by going to sea. There is nothing, however, in our laws to prevent the youths of this colony going to sea. A vessel can go round the world from one end to the other full of boys, provided she carries a complement of practical seamen to guarantee the safety of the ship and passengers. Our law goes further. It compels boys to be carried : it compels ordinary seamen to be carried. Sir. the honourable gentleman would like to see this, I believe : a 1,000-ton ship going to sea with nothing but boys at about 5s. a month. He would not care twopence for the ship or for the freight she carried, because she would be covered to the full value, and the whole ship could go down with everything on board. Mr. MONK .- 'They did not go down before these laws came into force. Mr. MILLAR .- Will the honourable gentleman show me whether there was any large proportion of boys before these laws came into force? If any honourable gentleman makes an assertion in this House where he can be contradicted let him give proof of his assertion. Let the honourable gentleman show me the proportion of boys carried twenty years ago on this coast. I say the shipping laws only came

<page>347</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=375></url>

into force in 1894-the only one the honourable ! that he is not there to set one side against the gentleman objects to. Does the honourable gentleman know that under the old English shipping law it used to be two men and a boy to every hundred tons. But what took place ? With every patent brought in there were so many knocked off, so that if you took the old shipping law now, with the modern vessels with all their

patents, you would find them going to sea without a soul on board. Follow the position out logically. I say all that has gone : and the honourable gentleman knows it. The honourable gentleman has seen vessels entering Auckland Harbour with only a handful of men on board. However, I hope the Bill will go through. It is, I think, a very necessary amendment, and, as I have said, there is no new principle in the Bill. In fact, the whole of the labour Bills introduced so far in the House this session have been nothing more or less than consolidating Bills, and this one I believe to be absolutely necessary, for there is really no new movement contained in it in any shape or form. Mr. MONK .- Sir, I wish to make a personal explanation. The Premier remarked that I had not contradicted the statement that I had nothing to do with the formation of farmers' unions. He is quite inaccurate in that respect. I have advocated the formation of unions, but the honour in regard to the formation of a farmers' union belongs to others. Mr. SEDDON .- I do not wish to do the honourable gentleman any injustice. I was informed that he had advocated the formation of farmers' unions. Mr. LAURENSEN (Lyttelton) .- I intend to support the second reading of this Bill. I believe if there is one thing more important than another that we have done this session it is the arranging to meet at this early hour, and as a result I do not think that we have had any debate during this session which has been more free from personalities, and in which a measure has been discussed in a more intelligent manner, than the debate which has taken place this morning. There is one amendment which I would like to see of the old Act, and that is to clause 35, which provides that members of Conciliation Boards shall consist of men elected by the unions, who shall sit on these Conciliation Boards for three years. Now, under that clause a man who gets an appointment actually has an interest in promoting disputes between employers and employés. If an amendment was proposed which would provide that when unpleasantness arises the union so affected should appoint an expert to sit in the Court, then I believe it would be a very important step in the right direction. I know of one instance where a member of a Conciliation Board used to go to the union meetings, and take part in those union meetings, and try to inflame the men against their employers. Mr. HUTCHESON .- It is regularly done here. Mr. LAURENSEN .- Well, I think whoever does it has a very poor opinion of the importance : a corresponding increase in the number of men of his position, and he ought to realise other, but to try and promote industrial peace. But as the Act stands at present it is all in the interest of that man not to promote industrial peace, but to promote industrial war ; and I would be very pleased to see an amendment in the original Act to provide that men who sit on the Conciliation Boards should be men elected by the unions at the time the dispute took place, and men who understood something about the question in dispute. I believe if that were done the Conciliation Act would go a very much further step than it has hitherto done in the direction of promoting pleasant relations between employers and employed. I was very much struck by the speech of the honourable member for Waitemata, and I wish to say, as one of the newer members of this House, that there are few members I listen to with greater pleasure than the honourable member for Waitemata, and when I hear his polished diction and beautiful and poetical language I cannot but help being impressed by his earnestness and power of delivery, and I cannot fail to be impressed with the desirability of seeing more of us copying his style when addressing the House. We never hear the honourable member for Waitemata descending to coarseness of language or personalities, things which are sometimes too much in evidence in the speeches of other honourable members. I know there are a lot of members on this side of the House who believe in radical measures, who consider that men like the honourable member for Waitemata are obstacles in the path of progress. I look at this thing - if I may say so without being egotistical - from a higher standpoint. I believe that instead of being obstacles in the path of progress an honest Conservative influence is as necessary to progress as the Radicals themselves. It seems to me to be the law of nature that you can only get progress with resistance, and I think if it were not for men standing up and arguing on the other side we should not have had the progress we have made. The honourable member for Waitemata expressed a

great desire that this country should occupy the place which it is fitted to occupy -- namely, that of a strong maritime country-and inferred that we were lagging sadly behind in this direction. While the honourable member was speaking I looked up two sets of figures, and here they are : Great Britain has one ship to every 2,600 of her population, whereas New Zealand has one ship to every 1,600 of her population. An Hon. MEMBER .--- British ships ? Mr. LAURENSEN .- I am dealing with ships registered and owned in New Zealand. I admit that in many cases they may have been built outside New Zealand, but they are owned in the colony, and to a very large extent, if not altogether, they are manned by men domiciled in New Zealand. Those acquainted with nautical matters know that during the past few years, although there has been a great increase in the tonnage of shipping, there has not been employed in proportion to the tonnage of the

<page>348</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=376></url>

vessels. Sir Lyon Playfair gives these remarkable figures: that in 1880 a steamer of 1,000 tons, fitted with all the then latest labour-saving machinery, required a crew of thirty-six hands to work her, whereas a similar-sized steamer launched in 1886, and supplied with the latest labour-saving machinery to that date, only required a crew of twenty-four men. In other words, the progress of invention during those six years was such as to save twelve men in the crew of a steamer of 1,000 tons register. That being so, we find that a less number of men than used to be required in the mercantile marine are now required-that is, in proportion to the tonnage of the ships. know also that officers cannot get certificates until they have served a certain period on board an ocean-going sailing-ship. How many ocean-going sailing - ships are there owned in New Zealand? There is a very small number indeed ; yet, in spite of that fact, I have known New-Zealand-born officers and captains holding positions on ships in almost every part of the world-holding these positions with credit to themselves and to their native country. I am very proud to know that, and I believe that we will yet have a very large maritime population. I join with the member for Waitemata in expressing my sincere hope that our maritime population will increase. I believe that our prosperity has been largely owing to the very rapid and unprecedented increase in our produce, and the rise in price of the various articles. Of course, there has been some unsettlement in the relations between the employers and the employees, and there has been more or less of industrial unrest; but when you speak of industrial unrest here and compare it with what obtains in other parts of the world. and with what obtained in New Zealand a few years ago, you will see the advantages of the legislation we have passed. For instance, there are the riots in Belgium ; in England there are continual strikes; and in America the state of affairs is such that millions are leaving America and putting their money into investments in England. Here in New Zealand, in comparison, we are living practically, so far as industrial war is concerned, in a garden of Eden ; and, in my opinion, whatever some members of the House may say to the contrary, I believe it has been brought about to a large extent by the action of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, an Act which has borne such good fruit during the past few years. Now, a number of honourable gentlemen have dwelt upon the question of high wages in relation to industrial prosperity. I, Sir, would like to draw honourable members' attention to a remarkable return presented to the United States Senate. Some four years ago they appointed a committee to inquire into the price of wages, the cost of living, the amount saved by the working-classes, and the cost of turning raw material into the manufactured article in different countries in the world. As a result of that inquiry, it was found that the countries that paid the heaviest wages, where the workmen had the best food and clothing, and saved the least, turned the raw material into manufactured articles at the least cost. That is to say, they turned iron into the manufactured article at far less cost in Great Britain and America, where the wages were high, than they did in Belgium and those countries where the working-people have low wages and live poorly. An Hon. MEMBER .- There is no labour legislation in America. Mr. LAURENSEN. - I admit that in

America there has not been much legislation dealing with the subject, and the result of that has been that workmen are fighting against the big We companies and big owners, and there has been murder and massacre between employers and employed ; and the result is that, instead of having a little unrest, there has been a bitter and ferocious feeling engendered between employers and employés. I think, therefore, America might very well take an example from what we have done in New Zealand. In New Zealand what have we done? Our manufacturers are able to ship across to Australia, where there are longer hours and poorer wages. and. in spite of protective tariffs, beat the Australian manufacturers. tural implements, and woollen goods also. for instance, are sent across in large quantities to both Victoria and New South Wales. Now. the only other honourable gentleman whose remarks I wish to refer to is the honourable member for Eden, Mr. Bollard. He referred to the farmers' grievances, and he said the result would be that the farmers would combine against the Government and crush them. Sir, there has been no Government in New Zealand that has done more for the farmers than the present one. It is admitted. Sir, by all the agricultural associations, even those that are opposed to the present Government, that everything possible has been done by the Government to enable them to grow their produce, to extend their markets, and do everything possible to bring the agricultural industry into a state of prosperity. And what has been the result ? that never in the history of New Zealand, as a country, has the farming community been in such a prosperous and well-to-do condition as they are at the present time. An Hon. MEMBER .-- Butter has done that. Mr. LAURENSEN .- Yes, butter has had a good deal to do with it; and no country has done so much to grade the butter and to foster the butter industry as New Zealand under the present Administration. Why, ten years ago the farmers' wives in Canterbury were selling their butter at 44d. per pound. That same butter to-day commands 11d. and 1s., and at the same time the price of butter in the London market was as good ten years ago as it is to-day. That result has been brought about very largely by the action of the present Administration. An Hon. MEMBER .- NO. Mr. LAURENSEN .- None can gainsay that. and I am quite prepared to produce papers that will convince even my honourable and Conservative friend, the member for Waitemata. Sir. I am very pleased indeed to give my support to

<page>349</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=377></url>

the present Bill, and I trust it will go through. : able for his employment, and he soon finds him- I hope, however, the Premier will see his way : self upon the street. Why, not many weeks to accept the suggestion I have made with regard to appointments to the Conciliation ; been eleven years in one employment, and cer- Board. Mr. ARNOLD (Dunedin City). . Sir, this morning, though we have had a simple amend- ment of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act placed before us. the discussion has been very wide, and the last speaker has taken us Home, and to America, and, indeed almost all round the world. I should not have spoken at all had it not been that I think it is necessary to go back to the question that is before the House, and to say one or two words with regard to questions that have been introduced by other speakers. The honourable member for Parnell first introduced the question of having men who represent the particular trade which has the dispute sitting in Court to deal with specific questions in different districts, and the same argument has been mentioned and upheld by the member for Lyttelton. Now, Sir. I think that members who know anything about these labour-laws, who know anything about the relationship of employer and employé. will at once see that those gentlemen have not considered the question thoroughly and from all points of view. Of course, we must recognise the fact that if you have a person sitting in the Court of Arbitration who has followed a particular trade at the outset he must know more about that trade than a person who belongs to another trade or business ; but the same sort of argument applies to a Judge of the Supreme Court, and yet nobody will say that a Judge of the Supreme Court cannot deal with any mercantile, trade, or other question that is brought before him, that

he cannot consider the evidence presented, and that his judgment upon the question will not be fair to all the parties concerned. And so it is with regard to a tradesman. You may say that the example of a Judge does not apply, because a Judge has had a legal training, and that training enables him to decide questions in a manner that will bring about the desired result. But, Sir, there is the training the tradesman has had. and the training of a working-man is quite sufficient to enable him, after hearing the evidence, to grasp the requirements of any trade that may be brought before him, and he will sufficiently understand the trade to make an award that shall be fair to both parties. And, Sir, while you have, as we have at the present time, a most excellent, learned, and fair Judge as President of the Arbitration Court I do not think that either party has anything to fear. But suppose that you go back and adopt the suggestion made by those honourable gentlemen. what will happen ? What happens to-day to the worker who is president of a union, or who is secretary of a union, or who conducts proceedings for the workers in arbitration or conciliation cases ? A very few weeks after a person has been elected president or secretary of a union, or has conducted an arbitration case, there is no fault found with that man on that account, oh, no! but it is discovered that he is not suitable in one of the large cities a man who had certainly must have given satisfaction during the whole of that eleven years or otherwise he would not have been retained. though he was not asking for more wages so far as he himself was concerned, yet he became secretary of the union, and within a very few weeks of his becoming secretary for the union he was dismissed. Why ? Not because he was secretary, such a thing could not happen, but because his work was now unsatisfactory, and his services were not required any longer ! And so to-day in all the large cities you have one man who in all probability is secretary to the Trades and Labour Council ; and as many local unions as possibly can secure this man's services. so that they may each give him a little remuneration and enable him to live independently of any employer, because private members of unions feel that if they accepted such positions, though their ability may be superior to the person holding that office, they would soon find themselves out of employment. And precisely the same thing happens in regard to the man who conducts arbitration cases. To-day, Sir, there are many men who do not belong to the trade which has a dispute, and yet, because they know a little of conducting arbitration cases, they could conduct, if they would accept them, two-thirds of the cases brought forward in their own town. simply for the reason that the representatives of the trade concerned, though they understand the dispute thoroughly and are qualified to conduct it. know that if they did so they might be made to suffer afterwards. If you say to-day that the Arbitration Court shall be made such that in each district you will have a new member appointed by the trade that is concerned, you will find it is not the skilled tradesman -- not the intelligent tradesman- who would be likely to represent that trade well and bring in an award that would be suitable. That man would not accept the position ; it would be some third or fourth-rate worker. He would receive the position, because he could not be compelled to suffer to the same extent as the other would. I hope, Sir, the day will never come when the law will be so altered that you will have a different Court to deal with different cases in each district. At present you have one expert person from the trade-unions, and you have one gentleman in whom the employers of the colony have confidence. These men, sitting with a Judge of the Supreme Court, hear the evidence brought forward by each side ; and the decisions of the past have shown that they can, and do, bring in awards that are equitable to all parties. Now, Sir, the question has been raised- it was mentioned by the last speaker, the member for Lyttelton -- with regard to members of unions who are also members of Conciliation Boards becoming agitators. Sir, if such be the case it is most lamentable, and nobody, I am sure, would regret the fact more than the labour unions of the colony. But, Sir, who

<page>350</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=378></url>

first commenced it ? I remember that, at the ' that he was about to make ; he desired that if first meeting

of a Conciliation Board called to hear an industrial dispute in the colony, one of { end, "because," he said, " I know that the ma- the employers not only sat as a member of the : jority of you have had enough to do; I know Board, but acted as counsel for his own side, he : that you are not in the position you were a at the same time being a party to the dispute. ; year ago, and I would like, if possible, that you What do we find .to-day? That one of the members of the Arbitration Court, who does : not represent the workers, but who represents the employers, goes from one end of the colony to the other not only agitating, but organiz- ing and forming industrial associations. This gentleman went down to Dunedin. He was successful there. He was the cause of an in- dustrial association being formed, and at the first annual meeting the chairman made one of the bitterest speeches against the labour-laws of this colony, against the Arbitration Court, and against the Government of the day that, I think, has ever been placed on record. Not only so, but the greater number of the state- ments made were not in accordance with fact. We have the same thing taking place in Auck- land and other parts of the colony. We are told the farmers of the colony are organiz- ing, and for myself I say that this is as it should be. The working-men do not lament the fact of the employers organizing. They can then meet them as a body. They do not regret the fact that the farmers, or any other em- ployers, are organizing; but I say, Sir, it is lamentable that a member either of a Concilia- tion Board or of the Arbitration Court should become an agitator and organize associations in any part of this colony. Then, again. Sir, we are told that the industrial war to-day is greater than it has ever been in the past. Why is that so? It is greater to-day because one hears more of it. That is all. Years ago there was an undercurrent of unrest that was not known by the community at large. To-day it is known, because an instrument has been placed in the hands of the workers of the colony by which they may gain, or strive to gain, justice from the employers without them- Selves suffering. Sir, in 1875-which is going a long way back-one employer in the City of Christchurch said to his employés, in effect, " I am going to reduce your wages." They said, "We will not accept your reduction." He said, " Very well, go out on thestreets. Ido not require your services any more." Next morn- ing they found the factory-doors closed. They went to other places, and the employers in these factories said to their employes, " Do you agree with the employés of Mr. So-and-so's factory ? " and on receiving a reply in the affirmative the employés of the other factories also were sent on the streets, and then they were told by the employers, " When you and your families are sufficiently hungry we will open the doors and let you in again." Sir, a few years 2.30. afterwards there was a small dispute in another city, and after the employer had kept his men out of work for a considerable number of weeks -some eleven weeks-he called them together about the 14th day of December. and told them that he knew that the great majority of them could appreciate the offer possible this dispute should be brought to an and your families should enjoys a plum-pudding for your Christmas dinner." Sir, those were the arguments, and the mode of warfare, on the ! employers' side : and I put it to the honourable : members who have spoken so bitterly upon this question this morning as to whether they desire that we should return from the position that we occupy to-day under the Arbitration Act and go back to arguments such as we had brought to bear in those times. But, Sir. there ! is another side to the same question, and that is that if the trouble was not decided by the employer by a lock-out it was by the employe by means of a strike. Now, in the City of Auckland, about the year 1893. there was a strike in a small trade which lasted for a period of six months. And I put it to honourable gentlemen who have not worked for their livelihood in the way the labourer or the tradesman does-who are not in the position described by one member last night as not to be able during hi- experience to provide for the future-I put it to them to strive to realise what it means to the working-man to be turned out of his employ- ment for six months, and the amount of suffer- ing that is not only imposed on himself, but upon his wife and his children. Now, this is what I wanted to lay emphasis on : that that strike cost to that one union the amount of \$7,000 in cash. And you must add to that the losses that had to be made up by the workers after returning to their work through . paying the bills that had accumulated during that period. But even

that was only one side of the question. At the time that this strike was commenced the industry was a prosperous and thriving one in the City of Auckland, and at the end of that time the whole industry had been so disorganized and so broken up that it has not recovered itself up to the present time. and to-day the manufacturers of Auckland in this particular industry will tell you that that strike was a curse to their trade in that city as far as that particular branch was concerned. Again I ask you, " Will you come back to that mode of warfare ? will you fight as you fought in those days?" Why, under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act we have had a great number of disputes settled, and I ask honourable members to try and realise what it would have meant if only a fraction, if only, say, one-fifth, of these disputes had resulted in a strike, and in all probability a larger number would so have ended. I say such things would prove a curse to our colony, and would have crippled our industries to a very large extent. We have had the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. We have had these disputes settled in such a manner that our colony has been able to go on and progress as we know that it has, and the cost of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act during the first seven years that it has been in vogue. -- that is, up to last year--was the small sum of \$5,404.

<page>351</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=379></url>

Why, Sir, from the standpoint of pounds, shillings, and pence. I say that that alone is a consideration which should make us appreciate thoroughly the Act that we work under at the present time. I sympathized with the remarks of the honourable member for Lyttelton this morning when speaking of the honourable member for Waitemata. Personally, there is no member in this House who more than myself appreciates the speeches, who more appreciates the language, who more truly considers the vocabulary that is used by that honourable member, being done by this Act, which, I say, is very gentlemanly as second to that of few, if any, of the members of this House, and there is no member I like to listen to better than the honourable member for Waitemata. But I do say this: that I have heard in the past of a certain person belonging to a certain class of persons who have nothing to fear from the legitimate working-man or the legitimate working-man, and, upon landing, asked if there was any Government there, and being answered in the affirmative said, " Well, I'm agin' it." Now, are not workers, those who know little of Sir, there are certain members in this House, who believe that they require the vote of the workers ask this question : " Did these people ever take off their coats in order to earn their livelihood ?" and if the answer be in the affirmative, a legitimate farmer or settler, but it is the men their reply is. "Then I'm against them." And they do everything they possibly can to cripple and to hold them back. The honourable member for Waitemata tells us that the farmers are organizing, and that they have a right to organize, that they are compelled practically to organize, and that they have to do it in self-defence. Why, Sir, it is only a few years ago when the workers of this colony and of other countries were not allowed to organize. It is not very long since the working-man could be sent to gaol if he dared belong to a labour union. The labourers have had to fight for this privilege, and to-day the farmers and Opposition members and the Conservatives of our country are reaping the benefits that were so dearly bought. There was a time, however, when the working-man had to go to the capitalist, when he had almost to pray to him ; and these were not only the words of his song, but of supplication also, as he said to these people,- Let capital shake hands with labour, Let the poor have the bread that they earn, For surely that they need every penny Is a lesson quite easy to learn. Remember the poor love their children, So give them a smile, not a frown ; Live and let live be your motto, Don't put the poor working-man down. But, Sir, that had no influence upon those who had the power in

those times, and the workers had to fight until this party, or the leaders of it, were in power and passed legislation which enables them - the workers-to enjoy the privileges that they have to-day. I say, Sir, that not only from our standpoint, but from the standpoint of the capitalist and the manufacturer, and the standpoint of every person who desires the welfare of the colony, the Conciliation and Arbitration Act is one of the best Acts ever brought into force, and I trust that it will never-I am sure it will be, as an honourable member has said - is brought before this House we have some of those speeches revived or resurrected which were delivered and were perhaps more appropriate ten or twelve years ago, and because there are those in this House, and also in the country, who are striving to persuade the people that there is a great deal of harm we are told to go slow, and I do not wish it to be understood that I have any other feeling than that we should go carefully. I say that the farmers, commercial men, and manufacturer's representative in this House. Those who are likely to go to extremes are those who to replace them in Parliament; and those whom the working-man has to fear is not the one in this House who have little sympathy or interest with those people, but who feel that it is here. We intend to go carefully. We have no intention of passing any legislation in this House that is likely to cripple any other part of the community or the country as a whole. There are two things only that I will touch upon in connection with this Bill, for it has been well debated by others. In the first place, there is registering under the Trade Unions Act has been mentioned here. This is very necessary, and no doubt the Premier will explain why, and I will leave it to him. But I wish to call the Premier's attention to the fact that at the present time it is necessary for all unions to be registered under both these Acts - that is, the Trade Unions Act and the Conciliation and Arbitration Act; and I want to point out this also: that if a union happens to register in the first place under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, then it is made impossible for them to register under the other, because they register certain rules under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act which the Registrar, who is a different person under the other Act, will not accept. I trust that will be looked into, and that it will be rectified by the Minister in Committee, if the amendment already before the House is not in itself sufficient. The only other matter worthy of comment is the question as to lawyers representing unions of manufacturers. Personally, I do not think it is advisable that they should; but I say, from the position of a labour member, that it matters very little as far as the conduct of a legitimate case or labour dispute is concerned. I say that the labour unions will not employ solicitors to any extent - they may as far as advice outside is concerned, but not in conducting their cases, for they feel that they can con-

<page>352</page>
 <url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=380></url>

duct these particular cases better than lawyers. When it is necessary that they should have legal advice they will get it outside the Court. The member for the Wellington Suburbs says. "A man who is his own lawyer has a fool for his client." An Hon. MEMBER. - It was a lawyer who said so. Mr. ARNOLD. - Sir, I have only three minutes more, but I wish, in consequence of the honourable member's interjection, to make a reference to one labour dispute that was conducted in this colony. A labour union said, "We will certainly have a solicitor to represent us." They had meetings with that solicitor day after day, and he drew up a brief of nearly a hundred sheets of foolscap. They took him to various small factories - they were not permitted to take him into the bigger ones - to show him the process of manufacture in that particular trade. But at the very last moment it was found that the employers would not allow them to have a lawyer to represent them. They paid that solicitor a bill of about \$60, and that solicitor, who is an ex-Judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand and therefore a qualified man, admitted that it would have been impossible for him or any other solicitor to conduct that case as a bona fide working-man had conducted it. An Hon. MEMBER. -- That was in Dunedin. Mr. ARNOLD. - No, that was not in Dunedin; but, Sir, the feeling, whether right or wrong, among workers is that they can conduct these cases better by themselves. And they are not afraid that the solicitor should be employed on the other side. They say,

" Let them all come " : but what they do feel is that if solicitors are permitted to appear before the Arbitration Court, instead of conducting a labour dispute they will have points of law continually rising, which will greatly extend the sitting of the Court, and which will weaken the cases as far as trade questions are concerned. Sir, I would not have risen but for the remarks of other members this morning. I have to thank the House for listening so attentively to me, and I trust that the second reading of the Bill will be passed without division. Mr. MASSEY (Franklin) .-- I had no intention of taking any part in this debate, because I was under the impression that the Bill itself was scarcely worth discussion, and I would not have spoken now had it not been for a statement made by the honourable member for Lyttelton. The honourable member told the House that whereas the price of butter a few years ago was from 4d. to 6d. per pound, it was now from 10d. to 1s., and he said that that increased price was owing to the policy of the present Government. It is quite true that the price of dairy produce is now better than it was a few years ago, but to what is the improvement owing ? Is it to the policy of the present Government ? Not a bit of it. It is owing to the invention and development of the refrigerator. That invention has enabled the dairy farmers of the colony to land their produce in good condition in the markets of Europe, so as to compete, and compete successfully, with the produce of other countries. The prosperity has been caused by the increased facilities given for export by the development of the refrigerator and the separator. I wondered when he was speaking whether the honourable member believed his statement himself. If he believed the statement, then I pity him : and if he did not believe it, then he has placed himself in a very unsatisfactory position. I can remember when the honourable member first came to this House that he very speedily acquired a reputation for common-sense and intelligence ; but this session, by the speeches he has made, he is speedily losing that reputation, if, indeed, he has not lost it already. He and some other members would lead us to believe that the prosperity of the colony as a whole is altogether owing to the Government. I admit that the colony is in a prosperous condition. But that has been owing to the South African War, and to other factors, which have caused a steady demand for our produce. Everything almost that we have been able to produce has been saleable at satisfactory prices. The cause of our prosperity is the demand which exists in other countries for our produce. That demand has been so great that the settlers have hardly been able to cope with it. In the dairying districts the settlers have worked day and night almost, in order to take advantage of the market. The consequence is that money has been flowing into this colony, and, as most of that money is spent on dutiable goods, the revenue of the colony has increased, and the Treasurer has had a very easy time in consequence. But to say that the Government is responsible for the prosperous condition of the colony is ridiculous. The Government have had no more to do with the prosperity than fish have to do with making sea-water salt. An Hon. MEMBER .- Do not give them credit for anything. Mr. MASSEY .- Very little; but I give them credit for looking after themselves, and that is about all. An attempt has been made in some vague and undefined way to show that the Farmers' Union, branches of which are being formed in different parts of the colony, is a branch or offshoot of the National Association. Why, the Premier was good enough to say that another gentleman and myself were responsible for starting the union. I claim no such credit. The union was started in the district represented by the member for the Bay of Islands, and it has spread over the country until it has excited the hostility and alarm of the Government and its supporters. The Premier, in his own elegant language, stated that the Farmers' Union is the "National Ass." in disguise. Whether it is so or not, it is quite evident that it is being persistently and bitterly opposed by the Liberal Donkey. Mr. R. THOMPSON (Marsden) .-- I would just like to say a word or two in reply to the statement made by the honourable member for Dunedin, Mr. Millar, as to the effect our labour-laws have on the employment of boys on our coastal vessels. The honourable member stated that our labour-laws have not interfered in any

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=381>

way with the employment of boy labour or { the institution in New Zealand of a scheme for apprentices. I happen to represent a district which, I believe, has produced more apprentices to the shipping trade than has any other district in the colony. The small fleet of coasting-vessels employed on the coast of the Province of Auckland has given employment to a large number of boys. A great many boys have commenced their seafaring career on board those vessels, with the result that a large number of young men have passed on from stage to stage until they have become masters of vessels ; but owing to the provisions of the Shipping and Seamen's Act they have not been able to learn their profession on our vessels for some years. They have had to go on board vessels in other countries and learn their business. A few years ago I endeavoured to get an amendment of the Shipping and Seamen's Act, by which shipowners would be allowed to employ two boys on each vessel, and they would be classed as one able seaman. But the honourable member for Dunedin City, Mr. Millar, opposed it, and I have no doubt the House would have passed it if it had not been for his opposition. He is regarded somewhat of an authority on shipping matters in the House, and I think it was owing to his opposition that the amendment did not pass. If our vessels carried one apprentice on board each vessel I think in a few years our whole coastal fleet would be manned by our own people. I think it would be better to agree to the suggestion I then made than follow the course we are taking now. So long as the present law exists our boys are completely shut out from a seafaring life, which I hold is a very unfortunate position for this colony to be placed in. Sir J. G. WARD (Colonial Secretary) .- I did not intend to say anything upon this Bill, inasmuch as I think that every member of the House recognises that the principle of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act has been confirmed both by this House and the country. As, since its adoption, there has been more than one general election. It is recognised from end to end of the colony that, if it is possible to prevent industrial strife, people on all sides of politics should endeavour to make the legislation as perfect as possible, so as to make the machinery run smoothly. Some honourable members have criticized the whole policy of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. whereas that system is not, by the amendments proposed in this Bill, on its trial. All are surely agreed that strikes, and the inevitable disaster to those engaged in strikes, should be averted wherever possible. Sir, some honourable members oppose. I have never been able to see any good in the policy of the Government or in its legislation, and they ask the House, Who is responsible for the success of the farmers of this country at the present moment. The Government are responsible for nothing good, according to the honourable member for Franklin. Now, I would ask the honourable member to carry his mind back to the time when it was I for Palmerston says, that it was so: and I proposed to bring about relief to the farmers by providing cheap money for them. Where was the Opposition upon the occasion to which I refer? They were all on the side of the money-lenders, and were strenuously opposing it, and forecasting disaster to the colony as the result of the introduction of a system such as that. Yet it is now admitted that probably nothing the colony has ever done gave the farmers so much relief and assistance, and put life into their great industry. Then, again, when it was proposed to abrogate what existed for many years in this colony, a system of taxation known as the property-tax, where were the majority of the honourable members opposite when the Government were urging that this great change should be brought about in the interests more particularly of the farmers of New Zealand ? Sir, they were all exercising their united efforts against that measure in the Government policy intended for the relief of the settlers in that important direction. They fought determinedly to keep the property-tax alive, although it was taxing the very vitals of the farming community. Again, the honourable member knows that during the last five years the Government has reduced the railway tariff by \$369,269 per annum. The great bulk of it has been given to the farmers of the country, and the farmers of the country recognise it, notwithstanding what may be stated by many who now try to throw dust in their eyes. Did the Conservatives ever go for reducing the railway tariff in such a direction ? Where

were the honourable members, when it was proposed by the present Government to do so ? What was their attitude? They were ever predicting failure and disaster. And yet, whenever a suggestion was made in regard to the Government having done any good, they immediately say the Government has done nothing in the direction of assisting the farmers of the country. An Hon. MEMBER .- Very little. Sir J. G. WARD. - Exactly. The honourable member is still labouring under that blind prejudice which has been so disastrous to himself and to others on the opposite side of the House. The majority of the farmers know that, as a result of what was done by the Government, and always against the strenuous efforts of those opposite, very great concessions have been brought about in their interests. Then, again, when it was proposed to entirely exempt from taxation all improvements under the land- and income-tax system, where were my honourable friends on that occasion ? Mr. MASSEY. -- That was before many of us came into the House. Sir J. G. WARD. - Why, I think, from memory, it was brought down in the Financial Statement of 1894. Mr. MASSEY .- Long before that. Sir J. G. WARD .- The honourable gentleman will pardon me: I think it was in 1894. Mr. PIRANI .- It was in 1894. Sir J. G. WARD .-- Yes : and if you will look at the Financial Statement of that year you, I think, will find, as the honourable member

<page>354</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=382></url>

ask honourable members whether, when the farmers were relieved of taxation on their improvements, the Government were blind to the interests of the farmers in that respect ? And honourable members opposite opposed this also. Now, with regard to farmers' unions, I quite agree that farmers' unions are a very desirable institution in the country if they are to be in the farmers' own interests : but if they are intended to serve some subtle purpose not disclosed to the farmers, in order to try and make the farmers go in a particular political direction rather than for the promotion of their own interests, well, those honourable gentlemen on that side will find that if they attempt to set up spurious institutions of that kind the farmers of the country are too keen observers to be deceived by any delusions of that sort. farmers' unions are being formed in this country -- political farmers' unions, as is alleged- it would be a very bad thing indeed for the farmers themselves. It would create strong antagonism from many quarters that are now friendly to them. But if these unions are being formed in the interests of the farmers as a whole, it is a right and proper thing, just as it has been a right and proper thing for their comrades in the town to form unions to protect their own interests. No honourable member, I am sure, can realise what has taken place in connection with the Waihi Gold-mine in the north without recognising what would have been the condition of affairs but for the intervention of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act in preventing a dislocation of trade, not only in connection with the Waihi Mine, but in connection with the miners and workers in the country as a whole. And if there was anything in our present laws that would prevent an institution of that sort from having its disputes with its men settled amicably by arbitration, or to subordinate it to the indiscretion or the greed of some persons outside the country, then the country would not be doing its duty unless it amended its legislation to enable the men to have their just grievances redressed : and if those of the men who are responsible for putting the grievances of the whole of their co-workers forward are to be punished. I say that is a strong argument why the law should step in and place them in such a position that no injustice can be done to them. I am surprised at the honourable member for Franklin, when he knows what goes on in such a matter as this, that he does not see that in this period of the twentieth century it is recognised that a great revolution has taken place in connection with the workers and the commercial and industrial world : and such views as those enunciated by the honourable member for Waitemata this morning, if they are the views entertained by people interested in the progress of a country such as this, why, it is almost like going back to the times when it was not considered right to have wages at all, but a wretched system of barter, which any one will admit was not in the interests of the country itself. Now as to all this talk about a high rate of wages .

lightened advancement in our country. I being disastrous to the farmers of the country : should almost have thought that those anti- Personally, I believe that consequent on the good times in New Zealand, and therefore the higher rate of wages paid in the cities and towns throughout the colony, has contributed very materially in the direction of keeping up the value of the farmers' products, and that surely makes more productive the properties of the farmers in the country, and the farmers recognise that is so. And anybody who thinks intelligently at all must realise that, if you have an underpaid class of workers in a country such as this, it is a bad thing for the people as a whole, farmers and every one else, apart altogether from the workers themselves. New Zealand would not be so prosperous to-day, either in town or country, if there had been a low rate of wages ruling during the last ten years. And I must say, while I think there should be every effort to put this Act - the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, or any other Act in this country - on such a basis as to prevent injustice, whether intentional or accidental ; when a proposal of this sort is brought down to amend what is universally regarded as a good law, a law which, if it were in force in Western Australia, for instance, would have been invaluable in connection with the railway strike there --- surely the common object of members on both sides of the House should be to prevent any injustice being done to the workers. As the honourable member for Dunedin City has stated, the absence of such a law in the past has been the cause of a great deal of distress and loss to families and others. It surely ought to be our duty, therefore, when we have an opportunity of amending the law and putting it on a proper basis, to do so. And then we find the opportunity is taken advantage of by the honourable member for Franklin to level at the Government the accusation that under their administration the farmers have been neglected. It is well known that such a statement is absolutely contrary to fact. I venture to express the opinion. if we look at what has gone on in the country during the past ten years, that. prior to the legislation and administration that has been in operation since 1891 in this country, the farming interests as a whole were neglected ; and most of the burden of taxation was unfairly placed upon the shoulders of the farmers and workers, and especially on the small farmers of the colony, for many years past. Since the present Government took office a great revolution has been brought about, and to assert that we are doing nothing for the farming interests, and that we are doing something which is inimical to their interests, because by this amendment we are trying to prevent a loss of wages and stress to a considerable body of the workers of the colony owing to the absence of a perfect Conciliation and Arbitration Act, I say is not consistent with what we find from experience in the colony itself. I only wished. Sir. to put on record my personal protest against the extraordinary antiquated and old-fashioned ideas which are being preached to us again by those representatives opposite, and at this period of er -

<page>355</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=383></url>

quated views would have been allowed to sink into oblivion. The Bill, in my opinion, is a necessary one. It is admitted that conciliation and arbitration is better than loss and strife as the result of preventable strikes. It ought to be our duty to make the Act better by amending. and I say that such amendments as are proposed in this Bill are both reasonable and necessary. Mr. MASSEY (Franklin). - I wish to make a personal explanation, Sir. The honourable gentleman who has just sat down, in the course of his speech. stated that I and others on this side of the House opposed the exemption of improvements from taxation under the Land- and Income-tax Act. I stated that he was mistaken. I have looked it up, and I find --- Sir J. G. WARD .- You said you were not in the House. Mr. MASSEY .- Quite so. I have looked the matter up, and have found that the exemption was made in 1893. I came into the House for the first time in 1894, and consequently I could not in any way have opposed the measure he referred to. Mr. SEDDON (Minister of Labour) .- Mr. Speaker. I may say I have been astounded at what I have heard. From the speeches we have listened to one might have thought that this was the first appearance of the

Conciliation and Arbitration Bill on the floor of this House. But honourable members were speaking more to their constituents than to their fellow-members, and other members were endeavouring - and I regret to say it - to widen the gap as between some sections of the community and others. An Hon. MEMBER .-- Why, you have lived on it. Mr. SEDDON. - Whatever I have lived on, at all events. I am a strikingly good example of what good things will do - publicly or otherwise. I say, Sir, however, that that is not the case. In respect of the Liberal party, the party on the Government benches now, there has always been a general support from the country. This has not been a Government that has had to depend upon the towns, or upon the support of the Labour party. Our policy has been a policy of promoting the best interests of the country, a policy that, whilst helping the towns, has always been in the best interests of the producers. We say that a change in the incidence of taxation was as much in the interests of the country, and even more in the interests of the people in the country, than it was in the interests of the people in our cities and towns. We say that the whole of our legislation has been upon broad general lines, applicable to all and beneficial to all, and that consequently it is only reasonable to expect that all sections of the community - all with the exception of a selfish few - would support the Government in the forward and progressive policy which has been before the country. Sir, as against that, the honourable member for Waitemata and one or two others will persist in their endeavour to set the country against the towns. Now, I would like to ask this question: What treatment did the farming people of the country receive at the hands of those who are opposed to us? When they were short of money, to make up that shortage they imposed increased grain rates upon the railways. That was their means and ways of meeting a deficiency. Mr. J. ALLEN. - Never our way. Mr. SEDDON. - I say it was your party. It was the Conservative Government when on these benches that raised the grain rates to meet the deficiency, and from that moment they lost the confidence of the farmers, and more particularly of the farmers in Canterbury. An Hon. MEMBER. - That is taking us to the "dark ages." Mr. SEDDON. - The "dark ages"! Well, it is by reminding people of the "wretched past" that we have compelled those gentlemen opposite to efface themselves and, for the time being, to come out as Government supporters. Then, there was also another way they had of helping the farmers of the country, when they found the imposition of the increased grain rate, and this throwing taxation upon the farmers, was resented by the farmers, who marked their censure at the general election which followed. The next time the Conservative party came upon these benches they said, "Well, it will not do for us to do as we have done in the past. If we want money through the railways we must not impose the increase ourselves. Oh, no; we will take the railways from the Government and hand them over to the Commissioners, and then when there is any increase of taxation through the railways upon the farmers the responsibility must be upon the shoulders of the Railway Commissioners." That is the way they shirked the responsibility, and placed it upon the unfortunate Commissioners. We know very well what the result of that was, and how that worked to the detriment of the farmers and of the country at large. I say that the conception, the appointment, and the working of the Railway Commissioners was the conception and the appointment of the Conservative party, and that it was done by the party in order to screw more money out of the unfortunate tillers of the soil of the country. And what, Sir, has been the result? Why, the moment we got rid of the Railway Commissioners --- and I fought that matter as bitterly as I ever fought anything in my life - An Hon. MEMBER. - You supported it. Mr. SEDDON. - If honourable members will look back they will see that I stated this before - that Hansard has been produced, and that member after member has stood up in his place in the House and has apologized to me for having made the same incorrect statement. Look at Hansard and you will find that in this you are wrong. I persistently and consistently opposed the Commissioners. I stonewalled the question. Yes, in that respect I plead guilty to having transgressed the ordinary rules of the House. You will find that in my speeches, I pointed out what would be the result. I said then that the Government

<page>356</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=384></url>

were shirking their responsibility in saying they were not able to manage the railways. It was only done for the purpose of using the Commissioners to levy high rates upon the producers of the colony. Well, Sir, what has been the result ? Since we took over the railways the result has been - An Hon. MEMBER. -- Why did you continue them for three years. Mr. SEDDON .- The honourable member is just as well aware as I am what occurred. The moment we had control of the railways and got them under the control of the Minister in charge there was an improvement, and the consequences have been phenomenal. You have had an increase in the traffic of the railways in contrast with the traffic under the Commissioner-, and we have given concessions amounting to nearly \$400.000 ; we have made concession after concession ; and while we have continued the working-expenses relative to the rates, the revenue has increased and so have the net profits, until I think that even those honourable gentlemen opposite must admit that for all those years when the railways were beyond the control of the people and in the hands of the Commissioners they were doing the farmers of New Zealand a gross injustice. And now what are those honourable gentlemen trying to do ? They are angling for the support of the farmers. We have been threatened that the support of the farmers will be withdrawn from us, and that they will avalanche-like come down upon us, and that we shall be utterly swept away. The honourable member for Waitemata, in his concluding remarks, said, "The honourable gentlemen on those Treasury benches will be swept away," and the honourable member for Eden said, " You will see the Premier brought to his knees by the farmers of this country." Sir, it does not require the farmers to bring me to my knees. I think the honourable member for Eden will admit that the difficulty both of us would feel would be to get off our knees. The honourable member knows, Sir, that he has been brought to his knees before to-day. At the last election he was only returned by a majority of three votes. And who was it that brought him to his knees? It was the settlers in his own district, who trusted him not. Sir, we find the honourable gentleman at one time posing as the champion of the farmers; at another time we find him attempting to pose as the champion of the labourers in his district, and endeavouring to provide homes for the workers. Now, Sir, if the honourable gentleman does not want to be brought to his knees again he must not be simply a labour representative. He must not simply be the representative of any particular section of his constituents. Sir, the men who stand highest in the public opinion, the men who are surest of their seats in this House, are the men who do justice to every soul in their constituency. And if that applies to members of the House, it equally applies to the members of the Treasury benches - to the Government -- who do justice to all in the colony. Now, Sir, some remarks were made about farmers' unions. I have been noting carefully what has been going on, and when the member for Waitemata, who admits, I think, that the commencement of these unions was made in his own district - An Hon. MEMBER .- No; in the Bay of Islands. Mr. SEDDON .- Well, the possibility is that they may have been started there with the view of getting rid of the member for the Bay of Islands. It appears the honourable member for Waitemata had no chance of making a commencement in his own district, so he advocated making a start in another district with the view of putting out of Parliament the honourable member for the Bay of Islands. Sir, I have every reason to be suspicious of these so-called farmers' unions when I hear that the Government is threatened by them. Who is it that causes that suspicion to be strengthened in my mind ? It is the honourable members who sit opposite and use these threats. Sir, I say this : it is well that there should be unions - unions of farmers, labouring-men, or other -. Union is strength : and in order to get the produce of the country to market at reasonable rates, and to see that the producers are encouraged by the State, it is proper and right that a union with such objects should be formed. However, when any union commences to lay down a little programme and says, " Unless you conform to this programme in respect to taxation and administration you cannot join with us." as this union has done in their programme, then it is not a

farmers' union at all. but a political organization. Under these circumstances, it seems to me the Auckland Farmers' Union is the National Association, phoenix-like, rising from the ashes caused by the last election. An Hon. MEMBER. - They are in the majority. Mr. SEDDON. - It is admitted that at one time the honourable gentleman claimed they were so, but that was when he belonged to that association, and when he, as leader of the (11- position, was the head of the National Association. In a speech he made in the Wairarapa district he said to the farmers. " Do you think you come here to listen to me? If you do, then you are stupid. What you have to do is to put your hands into your pockets and assist the National Association. If you do not do that, how can we expect to have a majority in the country ?" At all events, Sir. I must now come back to the Bill. I should not have digressed as I have done if it had not been for the speeches of the gentlemen opposite: It is not allowed their speeches to go into Hansard and go forth to the country without The honourable member for a refutation. Waitemata said to-day. "The statement that there is industrial quietude and good-will is absolutely fallacious." I say he is altogether wrong. The disputes, as they are called, are simply matters that are before the Court for adjustment. The cases before the Board and the Court are simply cases that have arisen on account of the extension of the Act to other industries, the workers in which are desirous of

<page>357</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=385></url>

having their position improved. If you will | members opposite should make such misstatement take the original industrial unions as they were registered under the Act, you will find there are no disputes with which they have anything to do at all, but that the matters are largely the outcome of the enlarged scope of the Act. The applicants are simply seeking for an adjustment of their position, and, therefore, to say that because that is going on there is bitterness existing at the present time is a statement that is not borne out by facts, and is not warranted. Then, it has been said that when men are working in a mine that is giving dividends they will receive a fair wage, and that those who are working in mines that are not working at a profit will have to put up with lower wages. Sir, that is a fallacy I cannot understand. Of course, there is a time in all mines when they are in course of development : and is it to be said that because of that fact the men engaged in them are to receive low wages ? I would like to put this position to members opposite : When that same mine is : yielding thousands of pounds-say, half a million sterling to its shareholders, as the Waihi Mine has done -- are the wages of the men who at one time worked for low wages to be largely increased, or are they to work for an ordinary wage while the shareholders are making their fortunes? No, the wages would not be increased. Sir, the work of a miner should not be considered on that basis at all. Investors and others who put their money into a mine have a right to pay the men who work for them a living-wage. The man who is working to develop the mine is not an interested party. He is in the position of the person who supplies the machinery, and it might as well be said that the machinery should be reduced in price as that the men should work for low wages. If we lay down that dictum we shall be altogether at sea. The member for Waitemata also said, " Unionism and the unions can compel the employers to produce their books." Sir, the Courts have held differently. An Hon. MEMBER. - Judge Cooper held differently. Mr. SEDDON. - No. All that has been held is this: they cannot compel an employer to bring his books before the Conciliation Board ; but the Court has held that, as a Court, it can compel the books to be brought before it. Well, you can do the same in any transaction before the Supreme Court in any case where there is a dispute. If that is the position in respect to ordinary transactions of the Court, where is the harm in adjusting the matter in the same way in the Arbitration Courts? Then, we had a question as to the boys engaged in factories. Well, I wish the honourable member to answer me this : Can he deny that during the time of this legislation-during the past eight years- the number of employes in the factories of the colony has doubled? That is my answer to the cry of the destruction of the industries on account of the legislation of the country. Sir, the

honourable member will not read up the position. It is truly astonishing that honourable A gentleman who aspires to be the ments. leader of the Opposition should not be 3.30. making statements across the floor of the House when, if he looks to the records. he would find that he is entirely wrong. I say, as Minister of Labour, with a due sense of responsibility, that during the last eight years the number of persons employed in the factories has doubled. Mr. J. ALLEN .- I say you are wrong. Mr. SEDDON .- Under these circumstances I can only say to the honourable gentleman that he is labouring under a mistake. Then, Sir, I am asked to agree to this dictum : that the settlers of the country were plundered by the unions of the cities. Now, Sir, if you double your factory-hands you double your consumption in the towns, and the best market for the farmer is to have a market at home. There is then no cost to him of shipping his produce in order that it may be put before the markets of the world. If you ask, What has helped to make the value of suburban lands-if you ask what has given to farmers the means wherewith they were able to supply their necessities and acquire an independence during the last ten years-I say it has been the policy of the Government ; it has been the improvement in the condition of the workers of the cities. What was the condition of the settlers a few miles from Wellington ? What was the position of the settlers a few miles from Auckland? What was the position of those in Christchurch ? Look at the rise in your land-values, look at the increase in your urban and suburban population. look at the increased value of properties, look at the amount of consumption at home now as compared with the consumption before this legislation was passed, and there is a complete answer. I say the best friends of the farmers are those who consume their produce in the cities, and if you want to keep both prosperous look first to your producers-in-chief, who are the farmers, and then see that the workers are working on proper lines ; and it is this that has helped to make our country what it is, and that will continue to keep it in its present prosperous condition. I say that as wages improve in the towns so wages have improved in the country. You go to any country where there is a low rate of wages in the towns, and you will find that the workers in that country are little better than serfs. We can take our own Mother-land as an object-lesson in that respect. I say that as you improve the conditions of the workers in the towns, so that improvement spreads to the country, and the country worker benefits as well as his fellow in the town. I would say to the towns : It is wise for us to go on on the lines we are going-not too fast, however, so that there should not be any mistake in what we are doing ; but, if we continue on the lines laid down on which we have been going for the last few years, I say our prosperity will continue. I say the good-will and confidence it has established between town and country will also con-

<page>358</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=386></url>

tinue. I will be no party to disturbing that harmony. Sir J. G. WARD. - I have looked up the Journals of the House for 1887, and they show that you voted against handing the railways over to the Commissioners on the second and third reading of the Bill. Mr. SEDDON .-- Thank you, my worthy colleague. I know the figures. My memory is as good as any one's. I know what my convictions are, and I have ever been consistent. and I opposed from the start the placing of the railways under the Commissioners. I opposed altogether the taking from the colony and from the people the management of our railways, and here are the division-lists :- Against the second reading : Messrs. Barron, Buxton, Parata, Seddon. Tellers : M. J. S. Mackenzie and Moss. Those are six. Then, on the third reading there were eighteen against : Messrs. Feldwick, Goldie, Grey, Grimond, Guinness, Jackson, Jones, Joyce, Mckenzie, J., Moss, Perceval, Seddon, Thompson, T., Turnbull, Vogel. Ward. Tellers : Barron and Fish. Those are the division-lists. I know what I am dealing with. I must now go on to deal with the objections to the Bill. If you will bring these things up yourselves, I cannot help it-you must put up with them. Now, the honourable member for the Bay of Plenty. I think, wanted to know particularly as regarded these clauses 4, 7, and 9: and the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson) also wanted to know. I say this is really in the

interests of the employers. In leaving out the trade-unions by the Consolidation Bill we made this mistake : that a trade-union, forming no part of the industrial union, actually can remain outside, and is not bound by the award that is made. If that union designedly so seeks to get rid of a particular award it simply maintains itself as a trade-union. When the Bill was in Committee, in order to make it perfect that must be seen to. My own opinion is that probably if we were to do it now in the interpretation clause of the Bill it would meet all that is required. However, when the Bill goes before the Labour Bills Committee we must perfect the Bill in that respect. I say that under subsection (2) of clause 20 we were told by the member for Bruce, I think it was, and one or two other members, that if they withdrew their union they were not liable- Mr. J. ALLEN .- I did not say that." Mr. SEDDON .- and if they only came off the register-what does it matter-they were not liable. Now it reads :- " The effect of the cancellation shall be to dissolve the incorporation of the union, but in no case shall the cancellation or dissolution relieve the industrial union, or any member thereof, from the obligation of any industrial agreement, or award or order of the Court, nor from any penalty or liability incurred prior to such cancellation." Mr. J. ALLEN .- What about afterwards ? Mr. SEDDON .- " What about afterwards ? " They are still liable, because under another section, which the honourable member seems to have forgotten. and that we put in last session, we can bring everybody under the Act. Under section 23 : - " An industrial dispute may relate either to the industry in which the party by whom the dispute is referred for settlement to a Board or the Court, as hereinafter provided, is engaged or concerned, or to any industry related thereto." If there is a dispute the Governor may bring these people in. Supposing we had not passed this Bill, if a trade-union sought to avoid an award because it was a separate trade-union. I say under this section the Governor could bring them in, and rightly so. Unless our law. are made to apply to all they will be a failure .. This is what was required in respect to the Bill. Now, with respect to section 12, as that point has been raised, the reason for that was this : Some of these unions have dwindled away in members to a very few. Some of their members have gone into other unions, and those who remained never took the trouble to have their registration cancelled : and it was to meet these cases that we drafted clause 12-that where they refused to answer queries and where they are practically dead it was better to wipe them off the register than keep them there, where they are a dead-letter. As we know, a large proportion of the members have joined other unions. I do not know that there is any other matter I can refer to. 1: respect to the contention of the honourable member for Palmerston, that the Act should not be made part of the machinery under which the hours of labour should be fixed, I say there is a great deal in that contention. In fact. in some measure that is the position already : but, as to making it general, I am perfectly open, and if the House wishes to meet the hours-of-labour difficulty in that way I am quite willing on my part. I do not know that there is anything more that is necessary for me to say. I am sorry there has been any debate of length. I said the Bill was of a technical character, and as such I expected- Mr. SPEAKER .-- Time is up. Sir J. G. WARD .-- I wish to make a personal explanation, Sir. During the course of my remarks I said that when the Land and Income Assessment Bill was before the House. the honourable members opposite voted against the proposal to exempt improvements from taxation. If the present Opposition were not here. then they are the shadows of the men who were here before them. Captain RUSSELL. - I rise to a point of order. The honourable gentleman is entitled to make a personal explanation if he is misrepresented. There is no question of misrepresentation, and he is now making a fresh speech. Mr. SPEAKER .- The honourable member ought to know the rules of the House in regard to personal explanations. Captain RUSSELL .-- He must know the Standing Orders. He was not misrepresent. J. and what he is now going to do is to back up what he has already said.

<page>359</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=387></url>

Sir J. G. WARD .- I do know the Standing Orders : and I have the right, Sir, I presume, having been

misrepresented, to make an explanation. The honourable member rose to make an explanation, and produced in support of it a record from Hansard. I then sent for a record also, and I propose to make an explanation on the top of the one made by the honourable member for Franklin. Mr. SPEAKER. - He has a right to make an explanation. He says he has been misrepresented, and he has a right to reply to that misrepresentation. Sir J. G. WARD. - On the 12th September, 1893, when the Land and Income Assessment Bill was in Committee, Sir Robert Stout moved that the subsection providing for assessments on land to be made after deduction of all improvements be struck out ; and there voted to keep in the clause: Messrs. Allen, Blake, Buick, Carroll, Duthie, Fraser, Hall, Hogg, Houston. Joyce, W. Kelly, Mackintosh, McGowan. McGuire, McLean, Mitchelson, Palmer, Rhodes, Rolleston, Seddon, Shera, E. M. Smith, Tanner, Taylor, Ward, Willis, Wilson, Wright, and Lawry and C. H. Mills, tellers. The "pairs " were Cadman, Dawson, Hall-Jones, W. Hutchison, J. Kelly, J. McKenzie, Pinkerton, Reeves, Sandford, W. C. Smith, R. Thompson, and T. Thompson. And there voted against the clause remaining in : Messrs. Bruce, Buchanan, Carneross, Duncan, Earnshaw, Harkness, Lake, Moore, Russell, and T. Mackenzie and Stout, tellers. The "pairs " were Buckland, Swan, Kapa, Taipua, Hamlin, Valentine, Fish, Richardson, Fergus, J. Mills, M. J. S. Mackenzie, and Mitchelson. Captain RUSSELL. - May I ask you, Sir, to invite the Hon. the Minister for Railways to put himself right by saying who misrepresented him, for he has not attempted to show who misrepresented him. Mr. SEDDON. - The member for Franklin. Mr. MASSEY. -- I am entitled to make a personal explanation. What happened was this : The member for Awarua stated that the member for Franklin, referring to me and others, had opposed the exemption of improvements in 1893. I was not in the House at that time, and consequently could not have voted on the question at all. Sir J. G. WARD. - I said that the party opposite supported the property-tax, and I said that when it was proposed to exempt improvements the party opposite voted against it. If the honourable member for Franklin was not here, then, of course, he could not vote against it, but his party did. Mr. J. ALLEN (Bruce). - I was here, and I want the honourable member to say that I did not vote against it, but that I voted for it. Sir J. G. WARD. - At that time the honourable member was an unaccountable quantity. Mr. SPEAKER. - I really think that these recriminations have lasted long enough, and that it is the desire of the House that the question should go to the vote. Bill read a second time. On the question, That the Bill be referred to -- the Labour Bills Committee, Mr. ATKINSON (Wellington City) said, -I would suggest to the Premier that there is no question of labour policy at stake with regard to the Bill. I understand that the sole reason for wishing to refer it to the Committee at all is the reason urged by one or two of us during the course of the debate, and that was that the whole of the draftsmanship wanted revising. The honourable gentleman thought that probably it could be more satisfactorily done by amending the interpretation clause so that a trade-union should come under the definition of an industrial union or be put in the interpretation of the term "industrial dispute," so that the Act would be made complete and shipshape and trade-unions made subject to it just as much as industrial unions registered under the Act. I would suggest that that is not the proper function of the Labour Bills Committee, and that the Law Draftsman should be brought into requisition, or, failing that, that the Statutes Revision Committee, at present in a state of suspended animation, should be asked to deal with it. Surely all that is required is technical revision by the Law Draftsman or a committee of lawyers. Mr. SEDDON (Premier). - I have had considerable experience in getting Bills through the House, and where there are differences of opinion in respect to the clauses, as now, it would be better to do it before the Committee which is specially instituted. The Law Draftsman will be there, and the honourable member and others will be there to see that the Bill gives effect to what is intended and required. That is all I desire to send it to the Committee for. I believe it is all right, and that the strictures on the Law Draftsman are altogether unwarranted ; but, to give the honourable member and others satisfaction we will take it before the Committee and go through it quietly. Motion agreed to. CYANIDE PROCESS EXTENSION BILL. Mr. McGOWAN (Minister of

Mines), in moving the second reading of this Bill, said it was of a very simple character. As the House would remember, the Government bought the rights of the cyanide patent and paid a certain sum of money for those rights. This Bill simply extended the time during which the money might be recovered from the companies and others who are using cyanide. An Hon. MEMBER .- How much is due ? Mr. McGOWAN said that a little under half the amount had been paid. The amount of £10,000 had been paid to purchase the rights of the patentees, and the Government had recovered \$4,253. and the object of this Bill was to extend the time in which it could recover the balance. An Hon. MEMBER .- How long will it take ? Mr. McGOWAN said it depended entirely on those who used the cyanide. He did not think it would take much time-perhaps a couple of years.

<page>360</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=388></url>

Mr. J. ALLEN (Bruce) thought it was right that the companies should pay for the use of this patent. At the same time the Minister should explain how much was still owing on account of this patent. He understood there was a balance of over \$7,000 owing, and that the receipts, instead of increasing, were decreasing. In that case he doubted whether the colony would ever get its money. Mr. McGOWAN .- Oh, yes. Mr. J. ALLEN hoped they would. There was, however, over \$7,000 to be collected. If the receipts were going to fall off at the rate of \$500 a year, as happened last year, the colony would never get its money paid back. Mr. McGOWAN would remind the honourable member that at the time the Government made this purchase from the patentees the position was that the latter were charging large sums to the companies -- in many cases from 7 to 10 per cent. It was in order to obviate this that the Government acquired the rights ; and, in order to make it easier for the companies, the Government only made a charge of 2} per cent. As to the amount of money which would be received, that would depend entirely on the companies using the cyanide. At the present time some companies did not come under this agreement, because they had made an independent agreement with the patentees. It was only reasonable that the Government should receive the money back again from the companies. He did not think it would take a long time to recover the amount, and then the companies could use cyanide absolutely without charge. Bill read a second time. PUBLIC HEALTH BILL. Sir J. G. WARD (Minister of Public Health), in moving the second reading of this Bill, said that its object was simply to include the Chatham Islands in the provisions of the Public Health Act. Mr. J. ALLEN (Bruce) asked the Minister whether he could see his way to allow the Health Officer at Dunedin to be the Lecturer on medical jurisprudence and public health at the University. He felt sure that if this request were granted the Government would be doing great good to the medical school there. The council of the University had asked that this should be agreed to, and he wished to know if the Minister could see his way to accede to that request. Sir J. G. WARD said he would be very glad to try and give effect to the proposal of the honourable member as soon as a permanent Health Officer had been appointed. That question was before the Cabinet at the present time. He saw no reason why the Health Officer should not, if it did not interfere with his ordinary duties. Five lectures on medical jurisprudence and public health. Bill read a second time. TRUSTEE BILL. Mr. SEDDON (Premier), in moving the second reading of this Bill, said his attention was drawn to this matter by a communication which he had received, and he might be permitted to read it. It would explain to members of the legal profession in the House the necessity for amending our law in respect to trustees, so as to bring it into line with the law in England : - " In England the law on this point has been settled by 44 & 45 Vict., c. 41, secs. 38 and 52. and 45 & 46 Vict., c. 39. sec. 6, and the draft suggested as an amendment of . The Property Law Consolidation Act. 1883.' The clauses in the draft are identical with the clauses of the Imperial statutes above referred to, except that in clause 1 the case of administrators has been introduced, and the provision is framed so as not to limit any right now existing.' The Bill was necessary to bring the law here into conformity with the law existing at Home. as the clauses were

identical with the clauses of the Imperial statutes which had been referred to. He had had several communications from trustees in the colony who had been unable, under the existing condition of things, to do justice either to themselves or to their trust. Section 2 dealt with the power of appointing new trustees. It read as follows :- "(1.) Where a trustee is dead, or remains out of the colony for the space of twelve months, or desires to be discharged from all or any of the trusts or powers reposed in or conferred on him, or refuses or is unfit to act therein, or is incapable of so acting, then the persons nominated for the purpose of appointing new trustees by the instrument (if any) creating the trust, or, if there is no such person, or no such person able and willing to act, then the surviving or continuing trustees for the time being, or the personal representatives of the last surviving or continuing trustee, may, by writing, appoint another person to be a trustee in the place of such first-mentioned trustee." Subsection (2) of section 2 provided for the appointment of a new trustee. Under subsection (a) the number of trustees could be increased; and subsection (b) provided that a separate set of trustees might be appointed for a distinct portion of the trust. Clause 3 referred to the retirement of trustees. It was as follows :- "(1.) Where there are more than two trustees, if one of them by deed declares that he is desirous of being discharged from the trust, and if his co-trustees and such other person of any as is empowered to appoint trustees by deed consent to the discharge of the trustee, and to the vesting of the trust property in the co-trustees alone, then the trustee desirous of being discharged shall be deemed to have retired from the trust, and shall by the deed be discharged therefrom under this Act, without any new trustee being appointed in his place." "(2.) Any assurance or thing requisite for vesting the trust property in the continuing trustees alone shall be executed and done." "(3.) This section applies -- "(a.) Only if and as far as a contrary intention is not expressed in the instrument (if any) creating the trust, and

<page>361</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=389></url>

shall have effect subject to the terms of that instrument; and .. (3.) To trusts created either before or after the commencement of this Act." He had in his mind's eye trusts where the parties who were appointed had left New Zealand, and had been absent for years from the colony, and there were other persons acting for them; but still the trustees who had left were held responsible. Section 4 was chiefly for the vesting of trust property in new trustees. Section 5 gave power to the new trustees. Section 6 simply stated what clauses were in substitution of clauses of the previous legislation. He might say, in conclusion, that the Law Officers of the Crown had advised him that the Bill was necessary, and he therefore moved its second reading. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) asked the Premier if he would consider the advisability of including another clause in this measure. The cases he referred to dealt with cases where money was left to a family by will, and the capital could not be divided until the children reached twenty-one years of age. There was not sufficient in the income to maintain the family, and perhaps for sixteen or seventeen years they had to struggle on until the time came to divide the money. Under the powers vested in the Public Trustee by the consolidating measure the Public Trustee could grant sufficient for maintenance in a case like that. Now, he thought a clause giving a trustee or a Judge of the Supreme Court a similar power might be included in the measure. He knew of several cases where great hardship was being inflicted in the way he referred to, and he thought, where it was a case where relief could be provided by statute, the Premier might take the matter into his consideration, and include a clause dealing with the problem in this measure. Mr. HERRIES (Bay of Plenty) presumed that the Premier had had this Bill carefully considered by the Law Officers. He would like to ask the honourable gentleman whether his Law Officers were satisfied that there was no way in this Bill by which a trustee could, when divesting himself of the office of trustee, also divest himself of the responsibility of his actions which were done while he was a trustee. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) might say, in reply to the honourable member for the Bay of Plenty, that he intended to send this Bill to the Statutes Revision Committee. In regard to

the question raised by the honourable member for Palmerston, there was no doubt that some alteration of our laws should be made, and it should be general in its application, and should apply to the cases he had mentioned as existing. There was a Bill moved last session, he thought by Mr. McNab, which to some extent set aside the power of wills. The Bill now before the House, however, was not a measure in which such an amendment should be included at all. There ought to be power given to deal with cases such as the honourable member had mentioned, and by which children who had something coming to them at the age of twenty-one could get assistance during the time they were being brought up. In some cases now they were thrown upon their relative .. and were an expense to them, on the understanding that when they became of age the expense would be met. He thought where money was required for the upkeep and education of children, when it was their own money, there ought to be power given by which they could receive some assistance, as it would be much better to do that than to allow them to drag on until they were twenty-one, when, in all probability, their whole life would have been blasted because there was nothing upon which to educate them. He would have the matter looked into, and, in all probability, bring in a general Bill dealing with the matter. Bill read a second time. CHINESE IMMIGRANTS BILL. Mr. SEDDON (Premier). - Sir, in the absence of the Commissioner of Customs, I may briefly say that we have discovered in the working of the Chinese Immigrants Act that, whilst the captain of a ship may, by taking some steps, allow his passengers to go ashore and stay ashore on the pretence that they are members of his crew - for example, he can take on board members of a crew, and he is not held responsible even though they go away and do not come back. I may say the point has not been definitely settled, but if such an interpretation can be given, then all the captain of a vessel need do is to take on two or three hundred Chinamen at 1s. a month, let them go to any port in New Zealand, they disappear, and the captain is not responsible for them. All I can say is that it is the intention of the Legislature that the captain or the owners or the agents should be held responsible, and take away whoever has been with them. It is to meet that point more particularly that this Bill is now before the House. It will not affect any dispute at present in issue. It will only prevent in future anything of this sort occurring, or any risk of its occurrence being run. Bill read a second time. ACCIDENTS COMPENSATION BILL. Sir J. G. WARD (Colonial Secretary) .- Sir. this Bill, as honourable members will see from a perusal of it, is, in the event of an accident, to enable the Judge of a Court in which proceedings are taken to order the person claiming compensation to submit to independent medical examination. There have been cases in connection with accidents in the colony, particularly in connection with the Railway Department, in which it was believed there was malingering indulged in, and under the law there was no provision for medical examination being made independently. It is proposed by this Bill that power for such an examination should be given, so that any person who claims compensation on account of an accident may be so examined, and the possibility of imposition prevented. That is the sole object of the Bill, and I beg to move its second reading. Mr. J. ALLEN (Bruce) .- Does this apply to the Workers' Compensation Act? Sir J. G. WARD .- No.

<page>362</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=390></url>

Mr. J. ALLEN .- I do not know why it should not. Sir J. G. WARD .- Because the provisions are entirely different. Mr. J. ALLEN .- But in that case malingering could occur also, and so there is no reason why independent medical examination should not be ordered in all cases. I gather it is to apply only to the Government. Surely the Act should apply in cases in which claims for compensation are made against others as well as against the Government. Sir J. G. WARD .-- That is so. Mr. HERRIES (Bay of Plenty) .- The objection I have to the Bill is perhaps only a Committee objection, but I should like to know whether the honourable gentleman introducing the Bill intends that the Bill should apply to workmen who, instead of suing for compensation for an accident under the Workers' Compensation Act, choose to

sue under common law, or under the Employers' Liability Act. I should like to know whether it is the intention of the Government that it should apply to every one except those under the Workers' Compensation Act. Sir J. G. WARD .- That is so. Mr. ATKINSON (Wellington City) .- I should like, before he replies, to call the Minister's attention to the third clause, which is very drastic. The word "compensation" in its operation, runs through the body of the Bill, besides being in its title. It is hardly the technical term in an ordinary action. Usually an action is not for compensation at all, but an action for damages. But this Bill is intended to apply to any form of action founded upon accident. The term "compensation" may cover everything, but it is not the ordinary term, nor is it the technical term. It might be desirable to add "damages." That would cover everything. Then, supposing a patient refuses to submit to examination, this clause 3 comes in :- "If the person injured refuses to submit himself to such examination, or in any way obstructs the same, his right to compensation under any Act or law shall be suspended, and all proceedings brought by him in respect of such compensation shall be stayed while such refusal continues." Is not that rather a drastic provision, to say that a claimant who resists examination shall be deprived of any remedy? Obviously, these cases being ordinarily tried before a jury, it would be almost conclusive against any claimant to refuse to submit to an examination. In a great majority of cases that would practically be conclusive against the bona fides of a claim; but it appears to me there may well be some cases in which, even after a Judge has ordered an examination, the jury should still be allowed to say that the claimant had some good reason for refusing to submit to examination. I put that, not dogmatically, nor with confidence, but I suggest to the Minister . to consider if he is not going a little too far in saying that the act of refusal should absolutely, without any discretion on the part of the Court or jury, deprive the claimant of his right to recover, and that if he refuses examination he shall have no remedy at all in respect of his complaint. I would ask whether it would not be better to leave to the Judge or the jury some discretion to remedy what might be perhaps, I admit, in a small minority of cases, an injustice. Mr. WILFORD (Wellington Suburbs). - I cannot agree with the remarks of the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson). I believe this Bill is necessary, and I will give one instance which I think will prove to most honourable members the advisability of passing the Bill into law. Some two years ago an action was taken in Wellington in which a man claimed \$1,000 damages against a steamship company for injuries he said he had received on account of a hawser breaking which attached a steamer to the wharf. The individual who claimed damages claimed that he had suffered injuries to his head on account of the rope striking across his head and knocking him down. There was a difficulty in getting him to submit to examination by a medical man at the defendant's desire; but quite by accident the defendants were informed that the plaintiff was blind of one eye. The eye was apparently a good one, but the defendants were informed that the plaintiff could not really see with the eye, and they felt that perhaps that infirmity had led to the damage. When the doctor gave evidence in the Court of the injury to the man's head, he was asked by the counsel for the defendant company whether it was a fact that the man was blind in the left eye, and the doctor said "Yes." It had not come out in the examination-in-chief at all, and the defendants only by chance were able to discover that the individual was blind on that side-a fact which materially affected the defendant's case. If the defendants could have demanded that a medical man should examine the individual who was making the claim for damages, that medical man would have made a complete examination in the first instance. It may be that it was not observed by the man who was acting on behalf of the plaintiff. Sir, I think the Bill is necessary, and I congratulate the Minister on having brought it forward. I think the instance I have mentioned will be some argument in favour of the measure. Sir J. G. WARD .- Sir, I would like to point out to the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson) that the necessity for clause 3 will be apparent to him when I mention what has occurred in our own case in New Zealand. For instance, let us take the case of a railway accident, where people go away immediately afterwards to their homes, and when there is no

opportunity to have them medically examined at the time. Under the existing law those people might refuse to permit an examination by a medical officer who was actually sent to examine them. even though it were under an order of the Supreme Court. and yet their claims for compensation would have to be considered and adjusted by the officers of the department and by the Government. We have

<page>363</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=391></url>

no opportunity at present of ascertaining whether or not the cases are such as should be fairly compensated. That being so, no injustice can possibly exist in clause 3 when it says " if they refuse to allow themselves to be examined." I think no persons could have good grounds for refusing to allow themselves to be examined. If permission to do so had been obtained under an order of the Supreme Court, why should they not be examined ? An Hon. MEMBER .- What is the necessity for clause 3 ? Sir J. G. WARD. - I thought I had just explained the necessity for it. I may say that it is not intended that this Bill, if it should become law, should interfere with the provisions of the Workers' Compensation Act. Mr. WILFORD .- It will be said you have no right. because it is a special right given in special cases. Sir J. G. WARD .- Well, I am dealing only with accidents that may happen to people outside of the Workers' Compensation Act. Take the case of railway accidents-the Rakaia one, for illustration. If it had not been for the adjustment that was amicably arranged by the department there we might have had disputes going on for years. I know the amendment is necessary, and think honourable members, on carefully looking into it, will also see that it is necessary. Bill read a second time. THE CONTINGENTS ON THE STEAMER "TAGUS." Mr. SEDDON (Premier) .- I wish to make a statement to the House. I have just received a telegram from Brigade-Surgeon De Lautour, of Dunedin. Honourable members will regret to know that there are eleven cases of sickness among our troopers on the steamer "Tagus." I have received information that Trooper Forbes, of the Thames, is dead. Last night I sent instructions to Brigade-Surgeon De Lautour that the cases of sickness were to be taken off the boat. I was requested to give permission for the buildings on Quarantine Island, in Otago Harbour, to be used for the reception of these cases. I refused my consent to that, and sent instructions that separate provision should be made for the cases. The reason the authorities asked for the Quarantine Island is that no beds were available in the Dunedin Hospital. My reply was that all the available beds should be taken for the men, and that the rest should be provided for in private hospitals in the city. There are about thirty-two cases altogether. I have since received the following telegram from Brigade-Surgeon De Lautour :- " Am making arrangements for removing serious cases to public and private hospitals this day." Captain RUSSELL .- What are the cases ? Mr. SEDDON .- They are cases of malaria, enteric, and one or two cases of pneumonia. The doctor puts a great deal of it down to overcrowding. REFERENDUM BILL. IN COMMITTEE. Clause 4 .- " In any of the following cases, that is to say,- "(1.) If a Bill is a rejected Bill within the meaning of this Act ; or "(2.) If a Bill passed by both Houses contains a provision that such Bill shall be reserved for the referendum ; or "(3.) If a resolution is passed by both Houses in favour of submitting to the referendum any legislative proposal (other than a Bill) set forth in such resolution,- then such Bill or proposal shall, in manner hereinafter directed, be referred to the vote of all the electors entitled to vote for the election of members of the House of Representatives." Mr. SEDDON (Premier) moved to insert, in subclause (1), the word " Government " before " Bill." The Committee divided. AYES, 41. Rhodes Allen, E. G. Herries Seddon Arnold Hogg Atkinson Houston Stevens Steward Carncross Hutcheson Lang Carroll Symes Colvin Tanner Laurenson Thompson, R. Duncan Massey Thomson, J. W. Ell McGowan McLachlan Ward Flatman Fowlds Meredith Willis Millar Witheford. Graham Hall Tellers. Monk Fraser, A. L. D. Hall-Jones Palmer O'Meara. Hardy Parata NOES, 6. Tellers. Bollard Lawry Allen, J. Russell, W. R. Heke Pirani. Majority for, 35. Word inserted. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) moved to insert, after " Bill," the words "introduced by message from His Excellency the Governor." Words inserted. Mr. J.

ALLEN (Bruce) moved, in subsection (3), after "by," to insert the following words : "one House and rejected by the other for two sessions of Parliament, or if a resolution is passed by." The Committee divided on the question, " That the words be inserted." AYES, 15. Tanner Arnold Lawry Thomson, J. W. Bollard Massey Mackenzie, T. Tellers. Fowlds Monk Allen, J. Hall Rhodes Herries. Hardy Lang NOES, 34. Fraser, A. L. D. Allen, E. G. Colvin Fraser, W. Duncan Atkinson Graham Ell Carncross Hall-Jones Flatman Carroll

<page>364</page>

<url><https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.32106019788238&seq=392></url>

Ward O'Meara Hogg Wilford Parata Houston Pirani Hutcheson Willis Russell, W. R. Witheford. Laurenson McGowan Seddon Steward Tellers. McLachlan Meredith Palmer Symes Thompson, R. Stevens. Millar Majority against, 19. Amendment negatived. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) moved to add the following as a new subsection : "If a Bill is passed twice by the House of Representatives and is rejected twice by the Legislative Council, and the House of Representatives so resolves." New subsection added. Mr. ELL (Christchurch City) moved to add the following new subsection :- " (6.) If a petition in accordance with the regulations, signed by not less than five per centum of all the electors entitled to vote for members of the House of Representatives, be presented to Parliament demanding that a legislative proposal set forth in such petition shall be submitted to the referendum." The Committee divided on the question. " That the new subclause be inserted." AYES, 9. Tellers. Arnold Laurenson Ell Lawry Atkinson Hoyg Fowlds. Tanner. Hutcheson NOES, 40. Russell, W. R. Allen, E. G. Houston Allen, J. Lang Seddon Lethbridge Bollard Stevens Carroll Massey Steward McGowan Colvin Thompson, R. Thomson, J. W. Duncan Me(fuire Mackenzie, T. Ward Flatman Wilford Fraser. W. McLachlan Meredith Graham Willis Witheford. Napier Hall O'Meara Hall-Jones Hardy Palmer Tellers. Heke Carneross Parata Rhodes Herries Symes. Majority against, 31. Motion negatived, and clause as amended agreed to. Clause 7. " The day so appointed shall be not sooner than twenty-eight nor later than forty- two days after the close of such session, but shall not be the same day as that appointed for the election of any member of the House of Representatives." Captain RUSSELL (Hawke's Bay) moved to strike out the words "forty-two days," before the words " after the close of such session, " and to insert the words "ninety days" in lieu thereof. Amendment agreed to. Mr. E. G. ALLEN (Waikouaiti) moved to strike out all the words to the end of the clause, after the words " such session." Words struck out. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) moved the insertion of the following words in lieu of the words struck out : "and if between the dates herein- before mentioned there shall be a general elec- tion for members of the House of Representa- tives, then in such case the referendum poll shall be taken on such general election day." Words inserted, and clause as amended agreed to. Clause 8. - " Subject to the provisions of this Act, such poll shall be taken in each electoral district in the colony by the same Returning Officer, at the same polling-places, and in the same manner as in the case of a general election, and the provisions of ' The Corrupt Practices Prevention Act, 1881,' and . The Elec- toral Act. 1893,' in so far as they are applicable, shall, mutatis mutandis, apply accordingly.' Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) moved the ex- cision of the words " in each electoral district in the colony by the same Returning Officer, at the same polling-places, and in the same manner as in the case of a general election." with a view to substituting the following words : " by post, in accordance with regulations made by Order in Council." Progress reported. The House adjourned at half-past ten o'clock p.m.