LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL. Friday, 1st November, 1901. Injured Members of Contingents - Old-age Pensions Bill-Factories Bill-Death of the Dowager Empress of Germany-Tour of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York. The Hon. the SPEAKER took the chair at half- past two o'clock. PRAYERS. INJURED MEMBERS OF CONTINGENTS. The Hon. Major HARRIS asked the Minister of Education, What provision, by pension or otherwise, have the Government made, or intend making, for members of the New Zea- land contingents wounded or otherwise injured while on service in South Africa ? When in Auckland lately he met a returned trooper named Canovan, of the Fourth Contingent, who had been invalided from South Africa. He had been wounded, a bullet entering his temple and making its exit at the back of his head. Seeing that there might be many more troopers in similar circumstances, and of whom they knew nothing, he thought it as well to bring this matter under the consideration of the Government, if they have not already had it brought under their notice. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said the Act that was passed last session-the Military Pen- sions Extension to Contingents Act-was meant to cover cases like this, and under that Act all

<page:1040>
a pension. # OLD-AGE PENSIONS BILL. IN COMMITTEE. Clause 4 .- " On the hearing of any application for a pension or renewal-certificate, if the Magistrate finds that any real or personal pro- perty has been transferred by the applicant to any person he may inquire into such transfer and refuse the application, or grant a reduced pension." The Hon. Mr. JONES moved, That the fol- lowing words be added to the clause: "or, if the Magistrate finds that an applicant has any near relatives in the colony who are able to wholly or partly maintain such applicant, he may accordingly refuse his application or grant a reduced pension. For the purposes of this section 'near relatives' shall be deemed to include wife, husband, father, mother, child, brother, and sister of the applicant." The Committee divided on the question, "That the words be added." AYES, 14. Peacock Barnicoat Johnston Bolt Pitt Jones Scotland McLean Bonar Williams. Bowen Montgomery Jenkinson Ormond NOES, 17. Kelly, W. Arkwright Swanson Taiaroa Feldwick Kenny Tomoana Gourley Pinkerton Twomey Reeves Harris Walker, W. C. Jennings Rigg Kelly, T. Smith, A. L. Majority against, 3. Amendment negatived. Bill reported. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- In moving the third reading of the Bill, Sir, I simply desire to state, for the information of the Council, there was a desire to know how the operation of clause 9 would come in. On the one hand, if all the Maori pensions are to be secured out of the Civil List the Civil List would have a heavy drain on it. On the other hand, it was urged there was no reason why a Maori should not get his pension out of the ordinary Pension Fund. The reason for keeping in this clause is this: that Maori registration of births in the case of very many Maori ap- plicants was not very well attended to in the dark ages, and therefore Maoris are very often unable to present a properly authenticated life- history to enable the Magistrate, according

to the Act, to grant them a pension; and it is to meet this difficulty in cases where the Government feel & pension should be granted that the Civil List is invoked. It will not be a very large expense, and I think the Council will agree that it is only fair to our Maori brethren that they should have the advantage of the Act. Bill read the third time. Hon. Mr. W. C. Walker The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER said,-This Bill may seem to be a new Factories Act, but really there is not very much in it-that is to say, the contentious matter can be reduced to a very small compass. It is a consolidation Bill ; and, judging from the opposition to the Bill, it was opposition mainly on two or three points. The first point is the limitation of the hours of men. That, of course, is a good point, and relates to clause 18. Then, there is the limita- tion of the hours of women-as to whether factories can run at all when women and young persons are not to be allowed to work the same number of hours as men. Well, if a forty-eight hours working-week is supposed to be enough for a grown man, I do not think any one can doubt but that it is too much for a woman or young person; so I think forty-five is a fair compromise, especially as we have found by evidence that in the clothing-factories particularly, where the work is hard, con- stant, and trying, forty-five is virtually the number of hours the people are engaged during the week. There is another question that is also involved-as to whether boys are to be con- sidered boys up to the age of sixteen or eighteen. The Bill as originally brought down stated they were young persons up to the age of eighteen. The Committee relaxed that, and virtually said that, in their opinion, after the age of sixteen boys could look after themselves. With regard to that, I think Parliament ought to be very jealous over the health of the young people. and 1 that, considering what the public conscience is now, and how it is always ready to protect the health of those who labour, we should consider that question very well. I am not prepared to agree with the arguments of those who maintain that, unless the age is raised, and unless boys are allowed to work after the age of sixteen, certain trades would suffer. This style of argument I listened to with a greal deal of doubt. It is the sort of argument we have had ever since the hours of labour have been attacked on every occasion during the last fifty years, and therefore I am not pre- pared to take all the evidence with regard to this question without a considerable amount of doubt. But I think, after that, there is hardly anything in the Bill which is new matter, and which the Committee could not very easily settle. It will be noticed in the schedules that the Committee struck out the schedule of ex- emption. Well, that is certainly the more scientific way of dealing with that question .. The weak point in a Bill always is if exemp- tions are brought in, because it shows it will not work universally. But apparently the Com- mittee thought that the exemption clause was being worked too far, and sooner than bring other industries in under the exemption clause they preferred to strike all the exemptions out. That is a matter entirely for the Committee of the Whole to consider. I beg, Sir, that you do leave the chair presently. The Hon. Mr. McLEAN .- Sir, this Bill, as my honourable friend says, although a long Bill,

<page:1041>

question in my mind now is whether our in- dustries are in such a flourishing condition at the present moment that they can afford to stand up against the legislation with which we are ha- rassing them every year. This Bill, no doubt, although it has been amended to some extent by the Labour Bills Committee, is certain to prove harassing to our industries at a time when they can ill afford to be harassed. Every one can see, if he only looks at the signs of the times, that our industries are falling away, and we should, at all events, take care that we do not put them out of existence. I have no doubt myself that, given fair-play, the manu- facturers in our colony can hold their own. But you have to give them fair-play in order to enable them to compete with .the outside world. We hear it said of late, "Never mind what is outside; never mind any one that is outside: let us look to ourselves, and try and reduce our hours of labour, and let us live happily." Well, that would be very good, and I believe in a man getting as big wages as he possibly can, and doing good work for them ; not as a certain gentleman in this Council said, " He believed in big wages and doing nothing for them." We have to compete with the outside world, and if we

are able to give good wages, then with all my heart I would say, let us give them, but let us exact labour from our men in proportion to the amount we pay, so as to compete with other people. Sir, I cannot very well refer to discus- sions on other Bills, but I may say that we have heard dissertations on this subject by men in this House who ought to know better, and, in my opinion, do know better, and still they talk as if they had no knowledge. Sir, is it right of us, knowing the true position, to persist in contracting business and in seek- ing to open the door for other nations? If we look at the increase of our Customs-and we glory in the increase of our Customs- is not a lot of that increase at the expense of our in- dustries ? I say you have only to take out the items and you will see what it is. I do not like to be repeating myself, but we have sent away a large amount of money to America for railway-carriages. If we had looked after our needs in time, if we had allowed our young people to be trained, and seen that they were trained, there would have been no necessity to send money out of the colony for foreign manufactures-foreign manufactures that are a disgrace to us. These carriages are badly constructed, and weigh three or four tons more than our own carriages did, and the extra ex- pense of hauling those three or four more tons along the lines will be an annual charge on the department. It is, to my mind, monstrous that we should be throwing away our money in this way. Then, look at the hundreds of thousands of pounds that are going away from this country for goods which our own people could manu- facture. Coming to another industry, which has the strongest union that has ever been in New Zealand - the Bootmakers' Federation-what is the condition of that industry now? Why, VOL. CXIX .- 65. we could have stopped its destruction. They talk about the ruinous foreign competition, and say, "Oh, it is only the surplus stock of America." They can manufacture there as much surplus stock as they like to send here. If we allow it to come in and trammel our industries in this way, then I say it is an injury to our colony. Let us see what the result has been to this boot trade owing to the restrictions we have put upon it. Men have started importing, and the process of importa- tion is just like a wave going along, because if one imports every one else will rush at the busi- ness, and the industry is ruined. What was the condition of that industry at the last sitting of the Arbitration Court? Did they not, with the tacit consent of the men themselves and every one connected with the trade, do away with all "logs," and with all the restrictions on machinery, and give a free hand so long as the wages did not come below a certain tally ? That was a proper thing to do ; but why was it not done four years ago ? for had it been we would have had no imported boots at all. An Hon. MEMBER .- Experientia docet. The Hon. Mr. McLEAN .-- Yes ; but is it wise for members of this Council to support such legislation as we have had when they know better? And are there not more in- dustries going to the wall too? Are we not importing cloth and made-up garments ? We should not import anything of that kind, and yet by this Bill we are further harassing our woollen-mills. All the evidence proves that the woollen-mills are worked one-third by men and two-thirds by women and boys; and, if you restrict the labour hours of the boys and women to forty-five hours a week, how is it possible for them to keep pace with the men, whose duty it is to attend to the machinery ? An exemption has been made of these mills in every Bill so far, because they are struggling, and in anything but a prosperous condition. In the Labour Bills Committee I endeavoured to have the woollen-mills again included in the schedule of exemption ; but that was de- feated. Then, Sir, it will be shown by my vote that I voted for the doing-away with all the exemptions. It was not that I have no sympathy with the exemptions ; but if you will not let in a case of urgent necessity, why let in the others ? If you are going to harass one, why not harass the lot ? Therefore it was that I voted to throw out the exemptions. Then, Sir, we have had a great deal of discussion in this Council about the Farmers' Union. Why should not the farmers, who are thoughtful men, have union ? It has been maintained here that the labourers of the farmers will rise up against them. Sir, the people in the country are thoughtful people; they know the difficulties of the farmer - how on the last day, when his crops are ready for harvest, a gale may come up and threaten to destroy half of it. And do you think these labouring-men have no sympathy with the farmer ? They are not like the workers in

towns-they do not meet in council with their officials; but these matters are discussed
<page:1042>
labourers in the country and the workmen in the towns. I do not fear any union of farmers or farm-labourers. But all these restrictions are raising the prices to the farmers and to the labourers themselves ; and the question is whether, with all these increases and increases, the people in our factories are much better off than they were before. They have to pay more for house-rent and for other things, and, allow- ing for the rise in wages, it is questionable whether they have gained a great deal. Now, Sir, to come to the details of this Bill : from the evidence with regard to boys it is apparent that the provisions in this Bill will mean a further restriction on them. The evidence from the foundries goes to show that all the boys employed are over sixteen years of age. The Hon. Mr. JENKINSON .- Some of them are not. The Hon. Mr. McLEAN .- I did not hear any master say that he employed boys under sixteen-they must be very few ; but the differ- ence between employing boys at sixteen and eighteen is considerable, and a change may help a good many in the industry. With re- gard to the forty five hours, if it could be kept to those factories where girls are at sewing- machines I would thoroughly approve of it, because I think if they do forty-five hours a week at that sort of work they do very well. I am quite satisfied that the good sense of the Council will allow the woollen-mills to be in- cluded in the exemptions, if necessary, by a special clause in the Bill. Some think that by including them in the schedule of exemptions the mills will get a free hand that they do not seek and do not want. Well, probably that is so. It is a very difficult Bill to follow, and it is a very difficult Bill to understand in all its phases ; but if the restriction as to hours in the mills of which I have spoken is removed by a new clause or otherwise I care little, so long as it is removed. If such a provision is not inserted I will do my best to stop the Bill going through. I am not desirous of showing opposi- tion to Government Bills. The Government are probably doing their best, and are trying to please those whom it is necessary sometimes to please ; but the question is, do they please the right people? You will never please the ex- tremists, of whom my honourable friend oppo- site is one. I say, what we should aim at is to try to please the reasonable people. I hope, if this Bill goes through, we will not hear of an- other Factory Bill for some time to come ; and I should have been glad if this Bill had stood over for another year to enable us to observe this year's working of the industry. Do not for a moment think that I sympathize with all employers. There are bad employers as there are bad workmen. We hear a great deal about men being discharged because they are unionists. Well, if you search into the truth of this you will find that there are many rea- sons for these discharges besides the charge of unionism. I heard one case mentioned the circumstances of which I know, and I guarantee Hon. Mr. McLean said to his foreman, "Oh, if you ' sack ' me I will bring the union down on you," and he would not do his work. How can you expect that that man should be kept on when he dis- organizes all the work of the place ? An Hon. MEMBER .- That man should have been " sacked." The Hon. Mr. McLEAN .- Certainly ; but it has been stated that he was dismissed because he is a member of a union. I believe, myself, that the employers are accepting the position very well. If a man has been dismissed because he is a member of a union I would not defend any such dismissal, but to my own knowledge there are many cases in which unionists have been bad workmen ; they did not care for their work, they were not steady, and they have gone to their unions and declared that they were " sacked " because they were propagating the principles of the union. I do not wish to take up the time of the Council any longer, but I do ask members to think of the outside worker, and to see what effect these restrictions have on our industry, and not to let us lead our own people astray to their own injury. I am quite satisfied that, if trouble comes upon our labour- ing population, they will turn round on us and tell us that we ought to have known better than to enact the restrictions which destroy indus- tries. As I have said, I am sorry to have occupied the time of the Council ; but I was determined to speak, so that if we continue these restrictions, at all events, I will have a clear conscience after having warned the people of what they might

expect. The Hon. Mr. RIGG. - Sir, I regard the speech of the honourable gentleman who has just addressed the Council as a certain amount of effervescence. The honourable gentleman went very wide of the Bill in his remarks. He appeared rather to be replying to speeches made in a previous debate. However, I do not in- tend to follow him on those lines. There are one or two statements he has made which should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. We are told that by passing legislation such as this we are weakening the industries of the colony, and that they cannot stand it. In reply, I would say, look at the evidence of the general prosperity of the factory employers throughout the colony. One does not need to go outside Wellington to see that large indus- tries have grown up wholly since the passing of the Factories Act of 1891. Others, which were very small and insignificant businesses, have grown to extraordinary dimensions, not only as regards the number of hands em- ployed, but also the splendid premises erected to accommodate those hands. This is a solid proof that the factory legislation has not injured industries to the extent the honour. What has been the able member claims. position of the worker during these prosper- ous times? Has he received that share of the general prosperity that he should have received ? I say, unhesitatingly, No. I hear an honourable gentleman sitting behind me
<page:1043>
he was. I say that is not correct. I say that thirty years ago he was better off than he has ever been since. I say the share the workers have received of the general prosperity is not proportionate to what the employers have re- ceived. Therefore one cannot wonder at the general discontent among the factory workers in the colony. The Hon. Mr. McLean was ex- ·ceptionally unfortunate in speaking about the boot trade; he spoke of the increase of the wages of the employés in that trade. The Hon. Mr. McLEAN .- No; the reduction in their wages. The Hon. Mr. RIGG .- Perhaps that is what the honourable gentleman intended to say, but I took a note of it at the time, and I under- stood him to say "the increased wages." The Hon. Mr. McLEAN .- I said that the wages of the bootmakers five years ago were higher than they were now. The Hon. Mr. RIGG .- I am sorry I mis- understood the honourable gentleman. Then the honourable gentleman referred to importa- tions in the boot industry, and there was a sug- gestion that these importations were encouraged by the reason of factory legislation. It has already been explained how the boot importa- tions have increased, so I need not refer to that ; but I would point out that the way to deal with a matter of this kind is not to reduce wages, but to raise your tariff and encourage local industry. I have seen in the premises of a large manu- facturing firm samples of boots made in Mel- bourne, for which I have paid 15s. 6d. and 16s. there, indented here at 9s. 6d. I have seen, also, samples of American boots which were im- ported here at a price with which we could not compete. Then I saw the very best sample of local industry as far as this firm was concerned, and I found that the principal part of the boot was made of imported English leather, with colonial leather for the sole. And, so far as this firm is concerned, their principal trade is in the cheaper kind of boots. That would seem to point to the fact that it is not the factory legislation so much that is at fault in regard to the boot trade as the inferior leather produced in this colony ; so that in discussing a matter of this kind we have got to take all things into consideration before we can arrive at a proper understanding of the question. I have suggested that we should raise our tariff and protect our industries. If this were done the number of men employed in the boot industry-and women too- would in- crease ; but in order to be successful it would be necessary to make some provision for the importation of suitable leather for the purpose of making a far superior class of work. Now, a reference has been made to a clause in the Bill which fixes the day's work for an adult male worker at eight hours, and harvesting has been mentioned as a case where this limita- tion of hours might be a serious injury to a farmer. The same argument is used in regard to other industries, such as freezing companies. The answer to this argument is that there is no limitation of the hours fixed that a man may hours out of the twenty-four, and keep it up till the man dies of exhaustion, and there is nothing in the Bill to prevent it. What would happen is this : After a man has done an eight- hours task he is

entitled to payment for over- time. The Labour Bills Committee, I think, showed a very reasonable spirit when amending this Bill. There was a give-and-take on both sides. When I say that, I mean those who spoke in favour of the employer and those who spoke principally in favour of the worker; and it was admitted that there were certain in- dustries which might suffer if you would not allow a boy under the age of eighteen to work longer than forty-five hours a week. This was recognised, and an endeavour made to meet the case by reducing the age to sixteen. It was felt that this would have an indirectly good effect, because it would result in the employment of older boys, and therefore give the younger ones a longer period at school. As regards women and girls, they will not be employed for more than forty-five hours in the week; but there are certain provisions which permit a certain amount of overtime. Evidence was given that the reduction of hours from forty-eight to forty-five would act against the interests of the employer in the case of wool- len-mills, as the workers were dependent on the work of the women and boys. But it does not seem to have occurred to those managers who gave evidence that it is only necessary for them to put in extra machinery, at which women and girls could be employed, in order to preserve the balance of their business. The work of the men starts at the beginning of the process, and not at the end, and if there is too much work at the beginning you have only to add to your plant and employ more hands to overtake it. It will be seen that the Labour Bills Committee has struck out the schedule of the Bill contain- ing exemptions. I am inclined to think that there are one or two industries mentioned in it which should receive special consideration. For instance, the making of jam at certain seasons of the year. But what is characteristic of those who support the schedule is that every interested party wants his own industry exempted, and approves of the Bill applying to the industries of others. I trust the Bill will pass, for, as amended by the Labour Bills Committee, I con- sider it an exceedingly reasonable measure. It does not go as far as other Factories Acts which are in existence. An Hon. MEMBER .- Where ? The Hon. Mr. RIGG. - Take the case of Victoria, for instance, and take New South Wales. I am inclined to think that in some respects the English Act is more advanced than this Bill. I say again this is a very reasonable measure, and one that should commend itself to the Council. The Hon. Mr. PEACOCK .- The honourable gentleman began his speech by saying that the workers do not receive wages in proportion to their employers' profits, and went on to say that, in walking along the street and seeing the big stores, he felt sure the country was prosper-

<page:1044>

wages, which I deny. Now, when I go along the streets and look around me I form a very different opinion, and, having myself at one time been in trade, I think to myself, " Dear me, what a big sum these people have to spend in the way of business to make so much show ! " and I find the interest earned upon the money which is spent on these stores must be very small indeed. Large, handsome stores do not always denote prosperity. With respect to the Bill I cannot find very much fault, but I must say it needs a few alterations in the direction indicated in the remarks made by my honour- able friend Mr. McLean. He seems to have got a very good grip of the necessities of different trades, and he mentioned woollen-mills as one of the industries that required special con- sideration. There are amendments necessary with regard to the working-hours of women and young persons. These persons are only to work forty-five hours, whilst men are to work forty-eight hours. Now, as all these have to work together at the same time, the hours should be equalised. The men prepare the work, whilst the women do the weaving. Most of the women work on piecework, and the men, if they are employed for the whole forty - eight hours, can prepare more wool than the women can spin in the forty - five hours. Now, the remedy, so far as I can see, is to reduce the time of the men to forty-five hours, if we are to decrease that of the women. I am sure that no woollen-mill that wants to make a profit is likely to wish to do that kind of thing, because it would decrease the output of the mill. think the women should be allowed to work forty-eight hours along with the men. The honourable gentleman thought it was too hard work for women to work forty-eight

hours. And so it would be in some businesses ; but I think it will not be denied that in a woollen-mill the machinery does the work, and the women have only to attend to the machinery, and it is not very difficult work. But when the atten- tion of the women is taken away from the ma- chinery, of course the machinery must stop. I know something about the effect in woollen- mills, because I am concerned in one myself. If this difference between forty - eight hours of labour for men and forty-five for women and young persons is to be maintained in the Bill the output will be considerably less, and that will be, therefore, a loss to the country ; while at the same time if the men are deprived of a part of their work there will be a loss to them in wages. I do hope that when we go into Committee we will be able to show that a change in this respect is for the good of the country-not so much for the good of the mill-owners, because I do not think some honourable members would think about that. I certainly think, as an employer, and I have always thought, that when wages are reasonably good employers generally are prosperous ; but when the wages are excessively high it allows, as the Hon. Mr. McLean has shown, a large importation of foreign manu- factures to come in, and therefore the em- Hon. Mr. Peacock and the colony loses. They have to place re- strictions in the shape of duties upon foreign manufactures coming into the place in order to maintain the excessive wages demanded. I hope that when we go into Committee some amendments will be made. I see the Second Schedule is struck out. I should like to say a word about freezing-works if I find the ex- emptions are not to be restored. The Hon. Mr. JONES .- They will be re- stored right enough. The Hon. Mr. PEACOCK .- If they are going to be restored I will not say anything about that. Freezing-works are different from any other kind of works, inasmuch as a great deal of work has to be done in a very short time, and unless you can freeze lambs when they are lambs you cannot send lambs away. Therefore these works must be considered. The Hon. Mr. A. LEE SMITH .- It is a little difficult to answer the arguments of my honour- able friend opposite, Mr. McLean. He is so transparently impressed with conviction as to the truth of the arguments that he has ad- vanced, and couches his remarks and his language in so genial and friendly a style, that he imposes on any person the desire to be careful he does not do anything that might hurt the honourable gentleman's suscepti- bilities. He has referred, Sir, to an honour- able gentleman opposite who is an extremist. I do not know exactly to whom he offered that remark, but I have reason to suppose it was possibly myself, because he implied I that a man with experience of that kind ought to know better. Well, I think that the true way to meet the competi- tion which the honourable gentleman says is getting so extremely close, and to reduce the excessive importations which are coming in to cause that competition, is by putting your system of manufacturing in a manner that will lead to a better condition between the two factors, capital and labour, and, further, to set to work in the best way we can to meet the progress that we see is taking place in other countries. Now, for myself, I think it lies in the direction of improved machinery, and to cultivate that technical aptitude which is so marvellously displayed in the United States. Any one, on looking into this question and summing up the difference which the factory legislation would make between the cost of labour in the future and that in the past, must see that it would be extremely small compared with the advan- tages which might be got, the saving which would be made by manufacturers taking every step possible to insure that they should have the very best appliances, the very best men, and the best organization that can be set up to produce upon the finest lines of production. Now, we see in America that these conditions prevail to an extent which you cannot find in any other country. Every manufacturer there, and most of his employés, are constantly on the watch to discover some means whereby they can save money, and they have the acuteness to see that in the selection of improved

hours by improved automatic methods with their products, the saving is immensely greater than any saving that could be made by any small reduction in wages. Therefore I think that if our manufacturers would take the same view of it, and not harp so much, as some do, against the factory legislation, I

believe they would be much better off. The honourable gentle- man referred to the Farmers' Union. I do not suppose that any one here has the slightest possible objection to the farmers taking exactly the same steps to improve their condition as any other employer of labour. They have a perfect right to do so. But the most I have heard in this Council in reference to the farmers was in the direction of stating that they have started in their new career in a very unfortunate frame of mind-that is to say, that they found a point of attack before almost they got into the har- ness of a union, and that they attacked their employés, and had thrown down the gauntlet, so to speak, to challenge them to fight, inas- much as they sent to Parliament a request that their labourers should not be allowed to have the benefit of the Workers' Compensation Act. Now, I cannot see that anything worse could be done. It is no offence in any shape at all to the farmers belonging to this union to say that they were unfortunate in their selection of methods to initiate their movement. So far as I am concerned, I recognise they have many great difficulties to encounter, and if by a system of working together they can get the benefits which other people in towns have hitherto derived by unionism they have every right to it, and I wish them well in it ; but I think they would have done better by not running the risk of creating difficulties, and a spirit of antagonism in those who worked with them, in the very first stages of their new career. In reply to a speaker the Hon. Mr. Peacock has alluded to the building of stores, and has also referred to the experience which those people have had of the small interest on the money which those stores bring in. There is a reasou for that. All people who are looking ahead in these towns do not build temporarily. They say, " Here is a fine site of land : we must not encumber it with a building which will be obsolete in ten or twenty years ; we must make ample provision for the requirements of the future, so as to secure that we get the full benefit of that store in twenty-five or fifty years' time, when the accumulation of wealth and business around us will enable us to get a very much greater interest than we have now. An Hon. MEMBER .- That does not show the present prosperity. The Hon. Mr. A. LEE SMITH .- Certainly it does, in that it shows that the people have got the spare money, and confidence and pluck not only to spend a large amount of money, but to spend it in such a way that temporarily they will have to make a sacrifice and be con- tent with only a small amount of interest, in order that they may secure in the long-run the great benefit that will accrue to them amongst others of the good prospects that they think honourable gentleman went on to say that ex- cessive wages prevent production and so en- courage imports. No doubt if wages are carried to an extreme extent, and so high as to hamper the operations of the manufacturer, that might result ; but if the honourable gentleman care- fully casts his eye over the returns of the last few years he will find that the exports have largely increased over the imports, and that, as regards the question of boots, I think it will be found, when the census comes out, that the ratio of increase in the production of boots in the colony is higher than the increase in the importation of the same. On this ques- tion it is to be said that the American has better leather and has also better boot-machinery. There is no doubt that they do not make ma- chinery of the same lasting-power in America as they do in England ; but the Americans never stick to old ideas-they take up any fresh improvement that is made-hence the fact that machinery there so soon becomes obsolete. These American boots that are coming in are good wear and have an artistic finish, and are much liked, especially by the female sex. But the solid industries of this country, I unhesi- tatingly affirm, have not suffered by any legis- lation that has been passed. When the census comes out I believe that will be proved to the letter. I do not want to see our legislation go much further in the direction of changes, be- cause I want to see some rest come, especially to those employers who have been so disturbed in their minds about this legislation. I desire that we should wait for a year or two, for I think that at the end of that time it will be proved that not only are we not going back- wards, but that we are going considerably forward. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS .- Sir, when I contrast the condition of the factory operatives at Home, as recorded in a book I have in my hand, called "The Effects of the Factory System," written by L. M. Clarke, I think we should be careful to maintain the very good conditions we have secured

in this colony ; and, also, we should be particularly careful, seeing the hours which are worked, the low rates of pay, and the great machinery we have to com- pete against in other countries, that we shall not run in a direction that may militate against retaining the success we have achieved in this colony for our workers. The Hon. Mr. Lee Smith has also stated that we should be careful now, so as to give a certain amount of assurance and consideration to those who are running in- dustries, that they will not be unduly ham- pered. I instanced yesterday that in Dunedin and Christchurch there are certain industries which are suffering owing to importations, and these are facts which are indisputable. Some honourable gentlemen may shut their eyes to these indications, but they are the straws which show how the wind blows. While I am at one with every honourable gentleman in this Chamber who holds views similar to those which I do in regard to legislation benefiting women and young persons employed in fac-
<page:1046>
tories, I still say we have to be careful that we do not overdo matters in the direction that we wish, and thereby injure our workers and our industries. This book records that at Home in factories they still work fifty-six hours, and their pay is nearly twenty-five to thirty per cent. less than we pay to the women and young persons in the woollen-mills and other factories in this colony. The Hon. Mr. Lee Smith is a keen commercial man, and he should be able to judge far better than I can as to what the dif- ference is between our industries conducted under a protective tariff of from 20 to 25 per cent. as against the importation of boots, clothing, and other goods produced under con- ditions where low wages and much longer hours are worked. While I keenly appreciate the favourable conditions our factory operatives enjoy here, we should consider whether, by extending these conditions, we are giving to keen business people at Home and in other parts of the world a chance of securing our markets. I will not weary the Council with extracts from this book, but I ask honourable gentlemen willing to read it to do so. By so doing they will see what favourable conditions exist in New Zealand as compared to those in England. We have had petitions presented by the Hon. Mr. Bolt and myself on behalf of the woollen - workers, wherein they state that they are under no great disability ; and if their hours are decreased they are to be the sufferers. It has been clearly pointed out that, under piecework rates, if their hours are reduced to forty-five per week it will mean as much as 2s. 6d. per week less to them. We have far more holidays for our workers in this country than other workers enjoy in other places ; and, moreover, the holidays are paid for by the employers. If the people interested express, as they have done through petitions to us, that their con- ditions are good, and they do not wish to be interfered with, I say we should consider their prayer and give our votes as our intelli- gence dictates. I was struck when reading the report of the Federation Commission, of which the Hon. Colonel Pitt was Chairman, to find that in the Commonwealth of Australia the hours of labour in the woollen industry are considerably more than those prevailing here- one of the mill-managers here stated fifty-six hours per week. If we intend to bring the working-hours down to forty-five for woollen operatives, I think we shall be giving an op- portunity to business people in Australia to cut in and take away a great amount of our trade. Lately I came down in the train with a warehouseman in business in Auckland, and who imports a considerable amount of cloth which is manufactured at Home. He said, "I can see we can import cloth from Home at a rate which gives us a very high percentage over what we can buy from the woollen-mills of this colony." An Hon. MEMBER .- Shoddy. The Hon. Mr. JENNINGS -I do not know about that. I am wearing some of the cloth at the present time, and it is as good as any I Hon. Mr. Jennings have obtained here. At any rate, the point is this : The majority of people, in regard to boots, clothing, and, in fact, everything else, will take- that which appeals to them as being cheap, looks well, and suits their pockets. That is the case, I believe, with ninety-five out of every hundred people in this colony. But, coming back to the Federation Report, I say we are so close that, with quick - running steamers, it will only be a matter of two or three days be- tween New Zealand and Australia in the near future ; and we should be particularly careful not to overdo by legislation anything

that will be prejudicial to our industries. I would be one of the strongest in this colony for advo- cating better conditions for women and young persons employed in factories. Personally, my view is that factory life is detrimental to females. It is not the best mode for a female to pass her existence. Females, however, must do something for a living, and anything that goes in the direction of enabling them to get their living honestly we should be very pleased to see. I hope the Council will give careful consideration to the proposal to bring down the hours of work in the woollen-mills from forty-eight to forty-five. With regard to the clothing industry, I have it on the information of one of the largest employers of females in this colony that he does not see any harm in forty-five hours a week being fixed. In my opinion, I think it is not right that the powers of the Court of Arbitration should be superseded by any Act of Parliament. Not only is that done in this Bill, but in others that have come before us. By statute we are im- posing conditions that cannot be altered by the Court of Arbitration. I have full confidence in the powers of . that Court for grasping the ques- tions that arise; therefore the whole power should be given to that Court to decide as to the hours that should be worked and the pay that should be given to the operatives in various industrial pursuits. I think it is a mistake that those powers should be taken away. I hope the Council will give every consideration to the Bill, and do that which is in the best interests of the workers, of the colony, and the industries concerned. The Hon. Mr. JONES .- The Hon. Mr. Mc- Lean, in his speech on this measure, spoke in such a way that he almost led me to believe that he was seated on this side of the Council. There was nothing censorious about the opin- ions he expressed in regard to the measure. and I must say that throughout the debate a high tone has pervaded the remarks of honourabie gentlemen, which, I am sure, will be advan- tageous to us in dealing with the question. The Hon. Mr. McLean asked, why should we send to America for railway-engines and other rolling-stock ? and he added, if we taught our own people to make these things there would be no necessity to send away for them. I admit- and I believe it to be the general opinion through- out the country-that it is inexcusable that the necessity should have arisen to send away for these things. I am aware that under the cir- cumstances there was no other alternative;

<page:1047>

but I say this : In view of the increase of the railway business of the country the Govern- ment ought to have taken steps to see that sufficient appliances were at hand to make the rolling -stock sufficient to keep pace with the increased traffic. But, apart from this, there has always been a tendency to send away for everything, from herrings to railway-engines. We seem to think that dis- tant pastures are greener than those we have near. I should like somebody to explain to me why there is any necessity to send away for rolling-stock when we can make it so admirably in our own colony-better, in fact, than that which we can import, and when the making of it would be to the advantage of our own people. I am aware that there is a difficulty. I am aware that the Hillside and Addington Work- shops have neither the room nor the appliances to do the work that is necessary. I have had it explained to me by an old railway hand, who occupied a high position in the department, that, in order to enable the Government to cope with the demands made upon it in re- gard to rolling-stock, we shall have to remove the manufacturing from these two places and keep them merely as repairing-sheds. It has been suggested that large works should be erected on the banks of the Waitaki, where there is plenty of room, a good solid foundation for the steam-hammers, and any amount of power to drive the machinery, and where a large community could be maintained in peace and prosperity. An Hon. MEMBER .- Put it at Oamaru. The Hon. Mr. JONES .- I am not speaking of the question from an Oamaru point of view; I am dealing with it as a large public question, re- moved from all political considerations. I sup- #cc-zero pose, however, that the idea is utopian, because one can scarcely expect the people of Christ- church and Dunedin to surrender the advan- tages they possess in having in their midst the manufactories of rolling-stock. The Hon. Mr. McLean also spoke of the boot trade. He said it was ruined. I do not think what we have done in the

shape of labour legislation has had It any detrimental effect on the boot trade. cannot have been affected by short hours and high wages, because those conditions have not existed in the colony. The Americans beat us for many reasons : They make better boots and shoes because of their immense resources. They make better boots and shoes because the United States is the home of the boot- making machinery, and because of the in- genuity of the American people. The Hon. Mr. Rigg endeavoured to elucidate this difficulty, and to show how it might be avoided, by saying that there should be a further increase in the tariff on boots and shoes. He thinks that would increase the demand for our boots and shoes and the employment of our own people. He holds also that provision should be made for importing the necessary leather from the countries in which it is made. But we shall never be able to compete with America or any other country till we make leather which will compare favourably with that which comes made up from the countries from which we now import the finished article. I am sorry to say our methods of leather making are not of the best. In the first place, everything is sacrificed to the exigencies of the frozen-meat trade. The animals are killed so soon that the skins are not properly matured. Another reason which pro- duces a difficulty in the manufacture of leather is that our tanning is not up to the mark by any means. It is done too rapidly, and not by the best methods. I think that if the manu- facturers in this country would only import up-to-date machinery and expert boot- and shoe - makers from America, and see that the quality of the leather is improved, then they could compete with any country in the world. It is not, as I have already said, for the reason that wages are too high or that hours of labour are too short that we now find ourselves unable to compete with America in the matter of boots and shoes. The Hon. Mr. McLean, speaking as a member of the Labour Bills Committee, said that the ex- emptions were cut out by that Committee because woollen-mills were not included therein, That is a poor reason for cutting out No. 2 Schedule. I think it is a great mistake. There are special reasons for the exemptions in this schedule, and I am sure that the Council will see that those industries which deal with perishable commodities shall be treated con- siderately. Not only that, but that woollen- mills shall also be dealt with in the same spirit. It would not do to include the woollen-mills in the schedule, because it would place them in a position in other respects which would be un- desirable. My intention is to move a new clause dealing with this matter. The Hon. Mr. Rigg has an idea, for which I dare say he has some reason or other, that extra machinery would get over the difficulty - that if extra machinery were introduced into our woollen- mills there would be no necessity for women and youths to work longer than forty - five hours. It is, however, only those who under- stand the exigencies of the business who are able to give any opinion on a question of this sort, and I have been informed by a woollen- mill manager that it would be utterly impossible for anything of the kind to be done-that if the hours of the young persons were reduced it would also be necessary to reduce the hours of the others. Sir, I am always glad-and I hope that every other honourable gentleman in this Council is glad-to see labour placed in the best possible position. I would like to see short hours and higher pay, because these things not only benefit those who are im- mediately concerned, but conduce to the highest satisfaction and prosperity generally. Sir, in dealing with this measure we should not strain our eyes to behold the labourer and lose sight of others who are in question and who may suffer. Sir, one more word and I have done. The Hon. Mr. Peacock, in answer to the Hon. Mr. Rigg, said that these costly buildings which have been erected by the merchants and employers of our colony are no evidence of the prosperity of the industries which they carry

<page:1048>

industries were not paying. But these em- ployers have been virtually pulling down their barns and building greater year after year, and, I ask, where does the money come from to do this work? Is it likely these men, who are keen and businesslike, and who know per- fectly well what they are about, who never do anything without turning over money, would put their money into large industries if they were not likely to prove remunerative ? Sir, the clause which I intend to move is this :- "The provisions of the last

preceding section are hereby modified in the case of woollen-mills to the extent following, that is to say : Women and boys may be employed therein (a) for not more than forty-eight hours, excluding meal- times, in any one week ; and (b) for not more than eight hours and three-quarters in any one day ; and (c) for not more than four hours and a half continuously without an interval of at least three-quarters of an hour for a meal." That clause has been drawn up with the greatest care, and is, I understand, exactly what is required to carry out the object of those who believe that woollen-mills should be exempted from certain provisions of the Act which would hamper them unnecessarily. Sir, I take this action because I think we must be careful that we do not give to the workers a gilded money - box, and deprive them of the means of putting anything into it. The Hon. Mr. TWOMEY .- All that is in the Bill before the Council is whether the number of hours which shall be worked by women and boys shall be forty-five or forty- eight per week. That is the whole thing in the Bill, so far as I can understand it ; that is the only thing that is likely to create any great dispute. The speakers have wandered away from this very discursively in- deed, and I do not intend to follow them, except in one respect, and that is that I want to in- dorse the sentiments of the Hon. Mr. Rigg. It is absolutely certain that unless we protect our industries competition from outside will de- stroy them at the rate we are going on. I will give an instance of it. In Christchurch I was staying at an hotel with an expert from America, who was putting up bootmaking ma- chinery, and he said that he knew a firm in America that made no profit at all except the discounts they got on the purchase of their leather. They bought their leather for cash, and got a discount which was sufficient to pay them. The reason of that is, they were doing such an immense business, and purchasing such an immense quantity of leather, that there was a splendid profit on the discounts alone. It is impossible for us to com- pete with firms doing such an immense trade as that ; without protection it is utterly impossible, more especially when their working-conditions are more advantageous to the employer than those under which we work. Consequently I am entirely of opinion that some protection is absolutely necessary, and that un- less we get it our industries will go to the ground. Well, what happens is this: I believe Hon. Mr. Jones these immense concerns manufactured a certain quantity of boots and shoes, or goods of any kind. They sell at a great profit in the beginning of the season in their own country large quantities of these manufactured articles. They have then a surplus which they can sell cheaply, because they have their profit made already, and this surplus is sent in here, and they sell at less than cost price, and in that way that surplus ruins our industries, because it competes with our industries on unfavourable terms. There- fore, if the present standard of living, the present rate of wages, and the present hours of I employment are to be maintained in this colony, there is no means of saving our industries ex- cept by means of protection. The Hon. Mr. T. KELLY .- I propose to approach this question from the point of view of the farmers. It appears to be in accord- ance with the doctrine laid down by several honourable gentlemen who have spoken that the only way to increase the manufacturing productiveness of this country is to impose a prohibitive tariff on the goods that are im- ported. This is very interesting news to the farmers and graziers. Now, who will pay this? It is to be paid by the great bulk of the workers of the colony-that is, by those engaged in the farming and pastoral and dairy industries. Are their productions protected ? Certainly not. Take wool : A few years ago crossbred wool was worth about 9d. in London, and the cost of shearing was £1 per hundred sheep. This last year it is worth 5d. a pound in London, and the cost of shearing is exactly the same-that is, the cost of production is the same in both cases, and the gross proceeds are now about one-half; and yet the producers do not ap- peal to Parliament for special consideration. Now, what does the sheep-farmer do in that case ? He has to face this reduction, improve the cultivation of his land, and fatten more sheep by improving his methods ; and the re- sult has been, owing to more production of wool and a slight rise in sheep, that he has just got about the same price for his output as he did five years ago, when wool was 9d. The farmer has to compete with the rest of the world in wool, and it is the same with butter and cheese, and frozen meat, for the market is in London. You cannot protect the farmer

except by giving him cheap transit, cheap goods, and cheap money. This process of protection will not benefit the farmers of the colony at all, as it will result in raising the cost of the goods he consumes. America puts a heavy protection tariff upon the imports which compete with her own manufactures ; but who pays for it! The farmers of America, just the same as the farmers here have to pay for our protection. Farmers in America are three-fourths of the population, and they have to pay for the other fourth. A good deal of talk has been made about cost of production. What is it that enables a nation to manufacture cheaply ? First of all, climate, natural advantages-such as cheap coal and water-power-first-class That machinery, and intelligent workers.
<page:1049>
the advantages in New Zealand of manu- facturing, but we do not use a tithe of the power that is going to waste in our streams and rivers. We should direct our at- tention to utilising our water-power by generat- ing electric energy and devoting it to industrial work. We should use our coal more economi- cally by converting it into water-gas and de- veloping it in a gas-engine, and thus get one horse-power out of 1lb. of coal, and transmit the power to the machines by electric wire instead of heavy shafting and cumbrous pul- leys and belts. We should work in this direction instead of talking about protection. America has seventy millions of people to supply with goods, and her manufacturers take care that they are supplied at a very high price to the consumers. The manufacturers have first-class machinery, ample capital, great natural re- sources in the shape of coal, iron, and other raw materials; and they sell dearly to the American people, and ship the surplus all over the world at cost price. That is the American policy, which taxes the farmers chiefly to make millionaires. England has a different policy. She imports the raw ma- terials at the lowest price possible, for she has free ports, her workmen are supplied with cheap food, and she sends her manufactured goods to all parts of the world in her own ships at a profit. The danger to manufactures in England is this : that if America was to lower her tariff and have free ports America could easily compete with the world ; and England and other nations would have a difficult task to compete with her. Look at the capacities of New Zealand. Some forty years ago we had not a wood-working machine in the colony ; all the work was done by hand at double the present price. A few years ago butter was unsaleable at 4d. a pound. And why? Simply because the machinery for the various departments of the manufacture of butter and cheese had not been invented. The refrigerating machine, the cream-separator, and the improvement by cold storage and cheaper ocean transit-that is, the brain of the inventor - has done more for the working-man than all the legislation in the world. You talk about the ingenuity of the Americans. Where did America get her inven- tions from but from England ? America simply copied all her best machines from England. The reason why America is so far advanced in the use of machinery is that wages there were very high, and that stimulated them to intro- duce newer machines for certain classes of manu- facture than were used in England. With re- gard to England and her colonies, I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that we can compete with any part of the world on equal terms. England now could for a time under- sell America in her own markets if the tariff was taken off. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER. - If she makes her own terms. The Hon. Mr. T. KELLY .- How can you compete except on equal terms ? And I am cer- tain myself that any prohibitive duties such as of this country. Let us compare Victoria and New South Wales before federation. Victoria was our nearest market, but she had a heavy tariff, and only took from us what she could not produce herself, or could not produce in suf- ficient quantity. Which was the more pro- sperous colony, protectionist Victoria or New South Wales ? To my mind, New South Wales We were supplying was the more prosperous. goods to the New South Wales consumer cheaper than to the Victorian consumer, and whenever Victoria commenced to export her manufac- tured goods it was a failure. She could not compete with New Zealand. I am in favour of giving every advantage to the workers in our manufactories, but it must be on equal terms all round, both in town and country. Unless there is equality of advantages given to all the

result will not be to the advantage of the colony. The Hon. Mr. JENKINSON .- I am fully in accord with the proposed amendment the Hon. Mr. Jones has given notice of-that is, exempt- ing the woollen-mills from the operation of clause 19 -- and, for my own part, I would be glad to make further exemptions if it can be shown that by not doing so we are likely to hamper trade and to interfere with factories and establishments where perishable goods are dealt with. While quite willing to reduce the hours of labour and improve the conditions, I think the exemptions named in the Second Schedule should be made, because the condi- tions of employment in those factories could be dealt with very much better by the Arbitra- tion Court. What I am afraid of in passing a measure like this, and laying down hard-and- fast rules with regard to labour, is this : that we are now legislating when things are in a very prosperous condition, and this is not like an agreement for a couple of years or so-it is legislating until such time as the statute is repealed. Now, I think in many cases it would be very much better to allow the particular case to be dealt with by the Ar- bitration Court, and let the Court fix an award for one or two years, or longer if it chooses. We have just given more powers and lati- tude to the Courts, and I shall be content to allow them to deal with points that they must surely be better qualified to deal with satis- factorily than we are. At the end of two years things may be in a very different position to what they are at present, and we may find that at the end of that time we may hold very different views on hours of labour, rates of pay, and overtime from what we hold to-day. I will support the clause for the exemption of woollen - factories, and I shall be willing to support other exemptions proposed by honour- able members if they can show me that they are in the way of allowing factories and other establishments where perishable goods are dealt with to carry on their business with some slight chance of success. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- I have only a few words to say in reply. The Hon. Mr. McLean, who, I regret to say, is not here, spoke
<page:1050>
about our manufactures failing at the present time. I might just as well say that the Union Company is failing as that our manufactures are failing. Just as the colony is progressing and healthy, so are our manufactures doing good work and meeting with good results, and so is the Union Company prospering. No one has a right to say that without figures, which the honourable gentleman did not presume to bring before us ; and if he had dealt with figures we could have got at him. No one has the right to say without figures that the manufac- tures of the colony are failing. I have just as much right to say that in the same propor- tion as the manufactures of the colony are failing the Union Company is failing. Neither are failing. The manufactures of the colony are in a healthy condition, and there is no need for the honourable gentleman to try and throw doubt on the prosperity of any of our industries. . It is monstrous on the part of the honourable gentleman to make such a state- ment without supporting the statement with figures. I am sure, even if he had done so, he could not have made a good case ; and had he produced figures we would have been able to prove him wrong. And then he wants to know why the Government does not try to please the right people. What does he mean by that ? I suppose he could not forget that he was at one time a member of a Ministry that had to keep itself in power by very curious ways, and he had to please certain people, otherwise the Ministry could not exist. This Ministry, so far as I am aware, has not distinguished between "right " and " wrong " people. We What we want to do is are too virtuous. simply the right thing, but that does not seem to appear so to the honourable gentleman. So long as the thing is right in itself we do not want to please any particular people. As he has gone away it is difficult to deal with him. Another question I think he brought up was about getting the railway-carriages from America. Why should this be thrown up against the Government? Why should this be made a sin or a fault that they have com- mitted? It is no use honourable gentlemen trying to get away from this fact: For the last four or five years our railway traffic has been increasing to such an extent that it was hopeless to equip our workshops so as to be able to cope with the construction of carriages that were necessary. I hope no member of the Council doubts for a moment that the Government would have sooner bought car- riages

in New Zealand than outside. But the last few years the pressure on the department has been so great that there is no use ex- pecting that the shops could turn out a sufficient number of carriages to cope with the traffic on the railways. It might be said that more machinery might be imported, and then more work could be done. That is being done; but you cannot do all this work of a sudden : you cannot increase a shop 100 per cent. on its output all of a sudden. You have to get the machinery; and I can assure honourable gentlemen that, do as much as we Hon. Mr. W. C. Walker can, in the last few years our traffic has grown so much that, in spite of all our efforts in our workshops, we have not been able to keep pace with it in the matter of carriages and rolling- stock. The question was where to get them. It was a matter of time. We order them one year ; we want to get them in before the busy season next year. Naturally we would rather, being a British community, have put the con- tracts out with British manufacturers than with any foreigner. But what could be done ? The most important point of the contract with us was that the cars must be here at a certain time to be ready to take up their work in the grain season. The Hon. Mr. JONES. - They were not ordered soon enough. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- Well, there are only twelve months in the year. Parlia- ment meets only once, and you cannot order these things without you have got authority to spend the money. The honourable gentleman will not deny that. The Hon. Mr. JONES .- I know the diffi- culties that occur in our district through shortage. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER .- Well, I hope it is a growing district in every sense of the word. The honourable gentleman ought, therefore, to know from his experience that the requirements of the railways as regards rolling- stock increase year by year. But, still, Par- liament has to give the authority. We get it as soon as we can. We send our orders Home. and we cannot get English manufacturers to undertake to deliver at any particular time They say they will do it, but they cannot bind themselves to time. We find, however, that American manufacturers will do so. You want wagons in six months. They say, " All right, here is our price, and we will deliver at a certain time "; whereas if it were an English firm it would be different. I have a contract at present with an English firm of the highest standing twelve months over date. I suppose I could chuck it up. That is the mischief with Eng- lish manufacturers, and that is why the Eng. lish manufacturers are going to wreck their own country and their own trade: they will not study the necessities of the case, or recognise that they have to keep up to date-that there !s no longer the old easy way of dawdling along as their fathers and mothers did. They have got to get up to date and know that if a thing is wanted to-morrow it must be found to-morrow. otherwise somebody else will find it. That is the only excuse I can give for the Government going to America for wagons and carriages. I do not mean to say they are better than these made in England - possibly not ; but, still. they come up to date. They are supplied ac- cording to contract, according to our own de- signs ; and I do not believe, in spite of what the Hon. Mr. McLean said, they are too heavy or too clumsy, and not what we want. They were built to our own designs. The only trouble was something about the axle, and they were to be fitted at the expense of the contractors. The Government does not

<page:1051>

want to deal with America or Germany, or any other foreign country ; but there is no use deal- ing with the English manufacturers unless they do two things-supply the thing you want, and at the time you want. Our shops are working full time and overtime; we have not got the machinery to turn out more stuff than we do now. We are getting machinery, but you can- not do that all of a sudden in order to cope with a certain demand. I trust the Coun- cil will divest themselves of any idea that the Government have done anything but the right thing in trying to cope with this-I will not say abnormal, but natural, increase of the production of the country, which grows upon us to such an extent that it has to be dealt with in a prompt way. At the same time I admit our workshops ought to be always growing; but new machinery takes time to get, and it takes time to get special machinery so as to take on special work. I admit what has been said about the exemptions in this Bill. It is a difficult question. If a Bill has too many exemptions it might as well not be

passed at all. I am afraid the Bill now is somewhat in this direction. I do not see why woollen-mills should require special exemptions, because, after all, it is purely a matter of arrangement. Men work in a mill and young women work in a mill. If they have to pay weekly wages for forty-five hours to a woman or young person, it only means employ- ing so many more of them to keep the men going forty-eight hours, and no harm is done. But I am told some woollen-mills in the colony work their men overtime, and do not bring their women or young people back; the men are employed, and the factories get the benefit of their work. Of course, the question of perish- #cc-zero able goods is a matter for consideration, but that can be dealt with in Committee. Motion agreed to. IN COMMITTEE. Clause 19 .- Rules as to hours of work in factories. The Hon. Mr. BOLT moved to strike out "young person " and insert " boy." The Committee divided on the question, "That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause." AYES, 8. Harris Barnicoat Swanson Walker, W. C. Kenny Feldwick Reeves Gourley NOES, 14. Johnston Arkwright Rigg Smith, A. L. Jones Bolt Kelly, T. Bonar Twomey Williams. Peacock Bowen Jenkinson Pitt PAIR. For. Against. Shrimski. Jennings. Majority against, 6. Words struck out, and " boy" inserted. Clause 20 .- Conditions under which limit of working-hours may be exceeded. Subsection (6) .- " The Inspector may at any time require the occupier to verify the entries in the overtime-book by statutory declaration, in such form as may be prescribed by regula- tions." The Hon. Mr. JENKINSON moved, That the words "by statutory declaration " be struck out. The Committee divided on the question,. "That the words be retained." AYES, 9. Harris Arkwright Smith, A. L. Barnicoat Kelly, W. Twomey Bolt Rigg Walker, W. C .. NOES, 13. Bonar Kenny Jennings Bowen Johnston Reeves Feldwick Jones Swanson Gourley Kelly, T. Williams. Jenkinson Majority against, 4. Words struck out. Clause 29 .- Provisions to secure reasonable. remuneration to persons employed in factories. The Hon. Mr. JENKINSON moved, That progress be reported. Subsequently, The Hon. Mr. A. LEE SMITH moved, That the Council do at once divide on the question in. debate. The Committee divided. AYES, 14. Jones Smith, A. L. Arkwright Kelly, T. Swanson Bolt Bonar Walker, W. C. Kelly, W. Bowen Peacock Williams. Feldwick Rigg NOES, 8. Jennings Gourley Reeves Harris Kenny Twomey. Jenkinson Pitt Majority for, 6. Motion agreed to, and progress reported. DEATH OF THE DOWAGER EMPRESS. OF GERMANY. A message was received from His Excellency the Governor forwarding the following let- ters :- ## " RANFURLY, Governor. "The Governor transmits to the Legislative Council copy of a despatch he has received from His Imperial Majesty's Consul-General at Sydney, conveying His Majesty's heartfelt thanks to the honourable members of the legislative bodies of New Zealand for the kind sympathy shown on the occasion of the death of the late Empress Frederick. "Government House, Wellington, 1st November, 1901."
<page:1052>
für Australien, "Sydney, 23rd October, 1901. "My LORD,-The resolutions passed by both the Houses of the Legislature of your colony, expressing their deep sympathy with His Majesty the Emperor, the Imperial family, and the German people on the death of Her late Majesty the Empress Frederick, have been duly conveyed to His Majesty. "] have now been instructed by special order to transmit His Majesty's heartfelt thanks to the honourable members of the legislative bodies of New Zealand for the kind sympathy shown on the sad occasion, and I therefore have the honour to request that your Lordship will have the goodness to cause these expressions of thanks to be communicated to the gentlemen named. "I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to your Lordship the assurance of my highest consideration. "P. VON TRURI, His Imperial Majesty's Consul-General. " His Excellency the Right Hon. the Earl of Ranfurly, Governor of the Colony of New Zealand." TOUR OF THE DUKE AND DUCHESS OF CORNWALL AND YORK. The Hon. Mr. W. C. WALKER moved, That the following address be transmitted to His Excellency the Governor respectfully requesting him to forward it to the Secretary of State for the Colonies for submission to His Majesty the King :- "To the King's Most Excellent Majesty. "MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN, - We, the members of the Legislative Council of New Zealand in Parliament assembled,

respectfully beg to submit to your Majesty our congratula- tions on the safe return of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to England, and our thankfulness for the goodness of Almighty God for having mercifully watched over them, permitted their enjoyment of good health, and protected them from perils by land and sea." Motion agreed to. The Council adjourned at twenty-five minutes past twelve o'clock a.m. # HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Friday, 1st November, 1901. Privilege-Ministerial Expenses-Government Rail- ways Department Classification Bill-Tour of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York- Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill- Death of the Dowager Empress of Germany- Maori Lands Administration Bill-Government Railways Department Classification Bill. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER took the chair at half- past two o'clock. PRAYERS. Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) .- Sir, I wish to speak to a question of privilege. Yesterday the Premier, in replying to a personal explana- tion made by the member for Ashley, read to the House the correspondence relating to a proposal made by Mr. Meredith to the Assets Board in regard to the purchase of a por- tion of the Glentui Estate. He produced in this House all the documents relating to the application of Mr. Meredith to the Assets Board. Now, firstly, I wish to ask your ruling upon the question whether the Premier, being a member of the Assets Board, or whether he was a mem- ber of the Assets Board or not, had any right to produce in this House the correspondence of Mr. Meredith with the Assets Board and the decision of the Assets Board in regard to that proposal ? Further, I put to you, Sir, a second question as to whether the papers produced by the honour- able gentleman, being official documents, ought not to be laid on the table of the House. I pro- pose to cite authorities bearing upon the point. Firstly, the Premier referred to the application of Mr. Meredith. I do not speak of Mr. Mere- dith as a member of this House. I speak of him as the private individual-Mr. Meredith. The Premier, referring to the correspondence between Mr. Meredith and the Assets Board, asked the member for Ashley whether he would have any objection to the correspondence being laid on the table. The member for Ashley, speaking from his place in this House, said he had not the slightest objection. The Premier then said " In that case, if the honourable mem- ber would write to the Board stating that he had no objection, he (the Premier) would lay them on the table." Now, Sir, we know what the end of all that will be. The papers will not be laid on the table. There is not the least chance of that being done. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) .- I want to know whether the honourable member can comment on what has occurred, and prognosticate on what is going to happen, under the pretext of a point of order. The honourable member raised a point of order, and in that he is within his rights ; but the honourable member is com- menting now, and prognosticating what is likely to arise; and in that respect, I say, he is tres- passing and going beyond what is legitimate and right. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- I do not think the honourable member has gone beyond what is reasonable or fair in explaining the grounds of his question. Mr. SEDDON .- He has said the return suggested would not be laid on the table. Mr. FISHER .- You have given your ruling. Sir, and I protest against any further interruption. I will not have these interruptions. Then, Sir, I quote the ruling of Mr. Speaker O'Rorke upon the same subject given in this House on 28th July, 18.8. The question having arisen in regard to the production of certain papers by an honourable member, the Hansard record goes on to say :- "Mr. M. J. S. MACKENZIE .- As a point of

<page:1053>

documents on the table ? "Mr. SPEAKER .- The House is entitled to have official documents, when quoted, presented to it. All papers read by Ministers are liable to be called on to be placed on the table. " Mr. SEDDON .- I intended to and will com- ply with the rules of the House." I contend, Sir, that in accordance with that ruling you should demand that the honourable gentleman shall lay these papers on the table. If you refer to Barron's "Rulings of the Speakers," from 1867 to 1899, you will find on page 83, section 23, that " Official documents quoted from by Ministers must be laid on the table "; and then seven rulings are referred to, one by Mr. Speaker Bell, two by Mr. Speaker O'Rorke, two by Mr. Speaker

Steward, and again two by Mr. Speaker O'Rorke. On 27th July, 1893, Mr. Speaker Steward gave his ruling as follows :- "It appeared to him that it was for him to rule on the point, and that would end the discussion. The quotation read by the honour- able member for Inangahua was perfectly clear, and the point raised by the last speaker was also quite clear. It was never intended that private memoranda should be called for ; but it was laid down that, if official documents were used, then those official documents, subject to certain conditions, could be demanded. There were limitations. For instance, the ruling of Mr. Speaker Peel was very clear indeed on the point. It was a modern ruling- of 1887 : ' When a Minister quotes an official document the whole of such document should be laid be- fore the House. A confidential document is excepted from the rule that communications referred to in debate should be laid upon the #cc-zero table.' The whole point was, Was the docu- ment in question a private document, or a memorandum, or an official document ? In the remarks the Premier had just made he said there were certain other documents he read which were memoranda, but that that particular paper was an original document, and therefore he recognised the right of members to call for it, and his duty to lay it on the table. But, merely for convenience' sake, he had taken the liberty of keeping it back for a little while to have a copy made. He did not think the honourable gentleman, or any one else, had any right to withdraw it for convenience' sake : that should have been done by arrangement, and it would have been better that a copy should have been made there and then. But, as the honourable gentleman had stated that the document was in process of being copied, it would be laid on the table. The position was quite clear-that an official document must be laid on the table, but not a private one." "He did not think the honourable gentle- man, or any one else, had any right to withdraw it for convenience' sake." I lay stress upon that point. Mr. Speaker Steward's ruling is valuable, because it deals exactly with the thing done by the Premier in this House yesterday afternoon. " He did not think the honourable gentleman, or any one else, had any right to most audacious thing to do. The honourable gentleman having made use of the correspond- ence, to the great disadvantage of the member for Ashley (Mr. Meredith), then withdraws the document from the House. That, surely, should not be allowed. That would destroy all prin- ciples of honour and justice. Can there be any departure from Mr. Speaker Steward's ruling that, " When a Minister quotes an official docu- ment, the whole of such document should be laid before the House"? Now, Sir, the two questions upon which I wish to have your ruling are these : (1) Should the papers, being the property of the Assets Board, have been produced in this House by the Premier? (2) Having been produced in the House, and having been officially used by the Premier, must they not be laid on the table? I take it I have made the point perfectly clear, and that it requires no further elaboration. It has been definitely determined in the most conclu- sive language both by Mr. Speaker O'Rorke and Mr. Speaker Steward. Mr. SEDDON .- As to this point of order,- Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- It is a question of privilege, and my opinion has been asked whether a breach of privilege has been com- mitted. Mr. SEDDON .- I claim the right to speak. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- I am prepared to give my ruling on the point. Mr. SEDDON .- I wish to make a personal explanation. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- I do not see the necessity. You can make your personal ex- planation after I have given my ruling. Mr. SEDDON .- I ought to be the best judge of that. Mr. DEPUTY - SPEAKER .- I am prepared to give my ruling. Two points have been sub- mitted by the honourable member : First, should the documents, being the property of the Assets Board, have been quoted in making a personal explanation; and, secondly, having been quoted, should the documents have been laid on the table. In the first place, my ruling is this, -- - Mr. SEDDON. - I never quoted from a document. Mr. DEPUTY - SPEAKER. - I heard the honourable gentleman say he had certain docu- ments in his hand, from which he quoted, and my opinion is that the documents he was quoting from were not official documents within the meaning of the decisions of the House as quoted by the honourable member. It is entirely a matter of opinion or taste for the Premier, as a member of the Board, to decide whether he should refer to and quote from documents belonging to that Board. It is not

for me to rule whether he should do so or not. I take it that it is for the member who is in possession of those documents to exercise his discretion. On the second point-namely, that a breach of privilege has been committed in not laying these documents on the table, I am of opinion that no breach of privilege has been committed, because the documents quoted by
<page:1054>
any way be said to be official documents. An official document is, I think, a document con- nected with the Government of the country, or a document that has passed between officers of the Government and Ministers, or between one officer and another. This is a document belonging to a Board constituted by Parlia- ment, but which Board is in no way connected with the Government of the country. There- fore I hold that no breach of privilege has been committed. Mr. SEDDON .- May I be permitted to say a few words in explanation ? Mr. FISHER .- I rise to a point of order. Mr. DEPUTY - SPEAKER .- What is the point of order? Mr. FISHER .- Ask the honourable gentle- man to sit down. Mr. SEDDON .- This is the second time to- day in which the honourable gentleman has spoken discourteously to me. I must ask the Chair to protect me, or else I shall have to protect myself. Mr. DEPUTY - SPEAKER .- It is out of order for one member to dictate to another member as to what he should do. The proper course is for him to address the Chair on the point in dispute. I am quite prepared to hear the honourable member on the point of order as to why the Premier should not make a personal explanation. Mr. FISHER .- My point of order is that the Standing Orders distinctly lay down-and it is well known to members of this House- that the Speaker's ruling is final. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. - That is quite correct, and I shall not allow my ruling to be questioned ; but the Premier has asked leave to make a personal explanation, and I presume it is in reference to what the honourable member for Wellington City has said. Mr. SEDDON .- In the first place I never had any document in reference to the Assets Board, but I hold in my hand the statement I quoted from, and I am prepared to give it to the honourable gentleman or to lay it on the table of the House. I cannot do anything or say anything fairer than that. With your per- mission, Sir, I shall read the document. It is a document with a tag upon it and my speech notes. It is as follows :- "Mr. Forster, the General Manager of the Assets Realisation Board, informs me re Mr. Meredith's offer for part of Glentui Estate, that, on the 19th October, 1897, Mr. Meredith wrote suggesting the cutting up of Glentui, there being good demand and fair values ruling ; also urging the risks of decline in values. "8th April, 1898 -- Mr. Meredith asked me to quote for 500 to 1,500 acres of Glentui, part pastoral and part agricultural, adding, 'I am aware that at the close of last session of Parliament you signified your intention of having the property cut up and offered for sale by November of the present year. I there- fore anticipate your subdivision by approaching your Board at the present time.' We replied, Mr. Deputy-Speaker quotation for. "12th May, 1898 .- Mr. Meredith describes the land, which comprised pretty well the pick of Glentui. "19th May, 1898 .- Board advises a prefer- ence for offering for public competition. "28th May, 1898 .- Mr. Meredith, without any request from us, makes a definite offer of the Government valuation, plus 5 per cent .. the Government valuation being at rate of £2 4s. per acre for this portion of the estate. "3rd June, 1898 .- We declined, thanking Mr Meredith, and saying the Board was not unmindful of his desire to offer to the public, and had so decided." At the first sale by auction, the land applied for by Mr. Meredith realised an average of $6 per acre, and had it been held till the following year and offered at the second auction, it is be- lieved it would have realised considerably more. Members will see that these are notes which I have made myself from Mr. Forster's report in reference to this matter ; and the member for Wakatipu practically repeated what I said to-day in reference to this question when it came up in the House once before, as to the price, and as to the position and the circum- stances under which the offer was made. The honourable member said the land was wanted by settlers, and then was the first to apply for the pick of the land at half its value. Con- sequently, he did not dispute the question at that time, and there is no question now ; but I am quite prepared to make a precedent in this matter, so that members'

notes which they may make for their own guidance in making a speech should be laid on the table. I have no objection to make a start, and I shall do so now if the House consents. Will honourable mem- bers allow me to lay these notes on the table of the House ? Mr. MEREDITH (Ashley) .- I rise to a point of order. The Premier last night challenged me to allow the whole of my private correspondence with the Assets Board to be laid on the table. I said, " Certainly, I am willing." The document just read by the Premier is simply a document drawn up by the Assets Board, and does not in- clude my correspondence. I am quite prepared to allow the whole of the correspondence to be laid on the table, but I am not prepared to have an ex parte statement laid on the table, such as the Premier proposes to do, in order to justify his wrong-doing in making a personal attack on me. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- As to whether that paper should be laid on the table, that is a question for me to consider ; and I think it is not in order for any member to lay on the table his summary of or statement of the contents of original documents. The ori- ginal documents themselves are the best evidence of what they contain, and not that which has been summarised, either by the honourable member or by any one for him. Therefore I rule that the paper cannot be laid on the table. Mr. SEDDON .- I shall now resume my per- sonal explanation. The member for Wellington

<page:1055>

tain documents. It might be thought from what the honourable member said that I was keeping something back from the House, and so that there shall be no grounds for that contention I ask leave to lay the memoranda from which I quoted on the table. The honour- able member for Ashley has evidently come to the House to-day fully prepared to charge me, amongst other things, with want of good taste. I received no notice of his intention to bring up this matter. The whole thing has been ar- ranged upon premises that had no existence at all-namely, that I have quoted from these documents. I can only say that, so far as I am concerned, I have put the matter fairly, and there is a good deal more to follow. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- Do I understand the Premier to say that he is going to lay the original documents, or a true copy, upon the table ? Mr. SEDDON .- I said nothing of the kind. I said I would lay the memoranda I used on the table ; and if Mr. Meredith in writing re- quested it, the Board would agree that the letters should be laid on the table. Mr. MEREDITH .- Do the straight thing. Be clean-handed over the matter. Mr. SEDDON. - The honourable member should apply that to himself. It was he who started it. I may say that I said yesterday to the honourable member for Ashley that if he would write a letter requesting the letters to be laid on the table it would be done. I would be only too pleased to bring the matter before the Board and to get it done. There was no necessity for the member for Welling- ton City (Mr. Fisher) to bring the matter before the House. What has he got to do with it? Mr. FISHER .- That is my business. Mr. SEDDON .- So it is mine. If the honour- able member for Ashley had written a letter, as I asked him to do, I should have brought that letter before the Board, with a view of having his request complied with. The honourable member has not written to me; but he has probably been a party to the honourable mem- ber for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) bringing this up to-day. Mr. FISHER .- I rise to a point of order. Do you, Sir, hear these continued reflections upon myself and the honourable member for Ashley, or do you not ? Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- I do not con- sider there is any reflection in the supposition of the Premier, that the member for Ashley and the honourable gentleman had been parties to bringing up this matter to-day. Mr. FISHER .- The honourable gentleman before he sat down just now said that if he did not get satisfaction from this House, or words to that effect, he would deal with me outside. Standing Order No. 149 says : " The House will interfere to prevent the prosecution of any quarrel between members arising out of de- bates or proceedings of the House, or any Com- mittee thereof." I ask for your protection, Sir, in the matter. I did say, and meant it, that I would protect myself ; and surely I require to do so, consider. ing the manner in which I was attacked by seven or eight members at one time; and then the member for Ashley added one more to the number. However, I feel

able for the lot. Mr. MEREDITH (Ashley) .- The Hon. the Premier stated just now that evidently the whole thing was arranged - referring to my- self and the honourable member for Wel- lington City (Mr. Fisher), who raised the point of order. That is absolutely incor- rect. I have had no communication with Mr. Fisher either directly or indirectly, either ver- bally or in writing, and I had no knowledge whatever that he was going to bring up this question until he rose in the House. Sir, the right honourable gentleman read copiously from my private correspondence with the As- sets Board, yesterday afternoon, without obtain- ing my consent. Unfortunately for me, in May last my dwelling-house was destroyed by fire, with all my manuscript documents, including copies of the letters I sent to the Assets Board. The honourable gentleman last night, in using my private correspondence, did so without ask- ing my leave in any shape or form ; and he had an advantage over me, as I was not able to refresh my memory as to what I had actually written to the Assets Board. But I have, I think, a vivid recollection of what took place on that occasion, and I am prepared now to say to the Premier I express my entire willingness that the whole of the correspondence which passed between myself and the Board should be placed on the table of the House. The Premier has had the permission of the Assets Board to bring my private correspondence on the floor of the House and to read it. Surely he could have the consent of the Assets Board to furnish him with copies of the letters they wrote to me, and let the whole thing be placed on the table of the House. I court the fullest inquiries in this matter. Indeed, 1 am prepared to submit the whole question to an impartial tribunal, con- sisting of, say, a Commissioner of Crown Lands and any Stipendiary Magistrate in the colony, so that the whole matter may be inquired into, as my action is absolutely above suspicion. Mr. SEDDON rose to speak. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL .- What is the question before the House, Sir ? Mr. DEPUTY - SPEAKER. - There is no question. I presume the Premier, if he con- siders he has been misrepresented on this point, can say so. But I must say these personal explanations are becoming interminable. I shall have to restrict members to one speech. Mr. SEDDON .- The honourable member for Ashley was the first to bring this Glentui business forward on the floor of the House, and the member for Wakatipu replied to it. The honourable member for Ashley charged the Board with maladministration, and when he made that charge he was an interested party, and, having brought it on the floor of the House, I am justified in alluding to it. Now, if the honourable member for Ashley will write a
<page:1056>
that letter goes before the Board to be dealt with I shall endeavour, as far as I can, to see that the whole of the correspondence in respect to this matter is laid on the table of the House ; but it must be done in the proper way. Mr. FISHER .- The honourable gentleman has Mr. Meredith's letters there in front of him, so there is no difficulty about it. Mr. SEDDON .- The honourable member is wrong. I have not had the letter. Mr. FISHER .- They are underneath. Mr. SEDDON .- The paper I have under- neath is a letter from Mr. Percy Smith, the Government Resident Agent at Niue, which I am going to lay on the table. Mr. MEREDITH .- The Premier has mis- represented me in stating that I produced my private letter to the Assets Board, three years ago, when the question came up on the floor of the House. I had not the papers with me on that occasion. Mr. SEDDON .- I did not say that. I stated that the member for Wakatipu quoted the letters. # MINISTERIAL EXPENSES. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) .- I desire to lay upon the table a return showing the amount drawn by Ministers as salaries and travelling- allowances and expenses. It shows, first, in re- gard to the Premier,- Salary, 1st April, 1900, to 31st £ March, 1901 1,375 16 .. Travelling-allowances .. 259 10 Travelling-allowances, visit Cook 52 10 0 Islands .. Travelling-allowances, visit Com- 225 15 0 monwealth .. .. Expenses- In New Zealand 305 0 1 Cook Islands and visit to Com- 40 16 8 monwealth £2,259 7 10 The total amount, therefore, drawn by me last year was £1,913. As it has been stated pub- licly that I have drawn £4,069, I thought it would be interesting to members to know that the amount I drew from this colony, either by way of salary or allowances, was less than £2,000. Add to the £1,913, expenses incurred for steamer and coach fares, which moneys have been paid to those who

performed the service, and which I have given in detail, and the total is only $2,259 7s. 10d. That, Sir, is the total cost to the colony last year. The Minister for Railways, who it was stated had drawn in the way of salary and allowances ¥4,000, drew,- Salary, 1st April, 1900, to 31st £ March, 1901 1,113 House allowance, Ist April to 6th June, 1900 . . 36 13 Travelling-allowance 250 10 . . .. Expenses 276 17 . . . £1,677 4 3 Mr. Seddon £ s. d. Salary, 1st April, 1900, to 31st March, 1901 925 5 5 . . .. 200 0 0 House allowance .. .. 149 5 0 Travelling-allowance .. .. 87 7 3 Expenses .. £1,361 17 8 The Minister for Public Works received,- s. d. Salary, 1st April, 1900, to 31st March, 1901 925 5 $ House allowance, 1st April, 1900, to 28th February, 1901 183 6 $ Travelling-allowance 186 0 0 . . . . 161 7 6 Expenses .. .. .. £1,455 19 6 Captain RUSSELL .- You ought to debit yourself with house allowance. Mr. SEDDON .- No, it is a question of what I drew. Captain RUSSELL .- You have charged the others with it. Mr. SEDDON .- It is done according to law. The others do not reside in Government resi- dences, and therefore draw house-allowance. Then, the Minister of Justice received, -- £ s. d. Salary, 1st April, 1900, to 31st March, 1901 925 5 5 d· 6. .. .. House allowance 200 0 0 1 . . 81 0 0 Travelling-allowance 0 .. .. 119 14 9 Expenses .. . £1,326 0 2 The Hon. Sir John Mckenzie drew,- 8. d. £ 6 3 Salary, 1st April to 27th June, 1900 193 6 8 House allowance 48 .. 0 Travelling-allowance 177 .. .. 22 13 0 Expenses .. .. £441 6 $ The Hon. the Minister for Lands (Mr. T. Y. Duncan) drew,- £ s. d. Salary, 2nd July, 1900, to 30th November, 1900, and 1st to 31st January, 1901 473 2 4 House allowance, 2nd July, 1900, to 149 9 31st March, 1901 . . Travelling-allowance 54 0 0 .. 173 17 Expenses .. £850 9 3 The Native Minister drew,- £ s. d. Salary, 16th August, 1900, to 31st d. S. 575 16 2 March, 1901 3 5 .. 112 12 S House allowance . . . . Travelling-allowance 239 5 0 4 . . 55 10 0 Allowance, visit Commonwealth 0 233 8 0 6 Expenses £1,216 11 10 \--

<page:1057>

drew,- £ s. d. Salary, 29th October, 1900, to 31st March, 1901 .. 424 14 7 House allowance, 29th October, 1900, to 7th February, 1901 55 15 7 .. 0 23 Travelling-allowance 5 75 9 Expenses 0 .. $579 4 2 The Hon. Mr. Cadman drew,- d. € 8. Travelling-allowance 61 10 0 .. . . 6 4 Expenses 6 . . £67 14 6 Mr. J. ALLEN .- Did he draw no salary ? Mr. SEDDON .- No. Mr. ALLEN .- How did he get expenses then ? Mr. SEDDON .- He was a member of the Executive, without portfolio. The Hon. T. Thompson, who was in the same position, also drew for travelling-allowance £18. This paper is certified to by the Secretary and Ac- countant to the Treasurer ; and the total cost of the Ministry in salaries and allowances that they alone drew, and expenses incurred in respect to them, was £11,253 15s. 6d. As it has been stated by the honourable member for Ashley, Mr. Meredith, and as tables have been drawn up and made a matter of record in Hansard that we Ministers alone cost over £20,000, and that was the cost of Ministers to the colony, I think members will hail this return with pleasure. I may say it is already in the possession of members, because if members will turn to B .- 3 they will find all the salaries and allowances there mentioned. If they will turn further to an order of the House, on the motion of the member for Franklin, they will find the balance; but I think it is best to put the whole thing into concrete form, so that the Press and people of the colony may know that the vin- dictive and wild statements which have been made are not correct. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL (Riccarton) .- I wish to ask the Premier whether the statement read by him of what has been drawn by himself includes the house allowance, or, in the alterna- tive, the cost of maintaining and furnishing the Ministerial residence. If not, could he give any idea of the cost of maintaining the Minis- terial residence in which he resides. Mr. SEDDON .- My answer is, that I have drawn no house allowance. The law is, and no one knows it better than the member for Ric- carton, that a Minister occupying a Ministerial residence receives no house allowance. Conse- quently, I have drawn no house allowance ; and, as to the amount spent on repairs to the building, it has been no more than to any other public building, and I am only an occu- pant for the time being. The Crown is the landlord. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL .- My reason for ask- ing was, that I did not hear any reference in the Premier's return to what

he had drawn in that respect, while all the other Ministers who VOL. CXIX .- 66. amount weighted by house allowance. Con- sequently, that amount ought to be extended by at least £200-I will not say more - as having been drawn by him. Mr. SEDDON .- But I never drew it. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston). - I regret the Premier, at this stage of the session, has thought fit to obtrude a personal matter on the House-because this is purely a personal matter. Mr. SEDDON .- It is not a personal matter. Mr. PIRANI .-- We will agree to differ on the point. My opinion is that it is a personal matter. The Premier has brought this before the House because of certain statements made as to the cost he has been to the colony. No reference was made to any other Minister, and there was no need for the Premier to drag any other Ministers into it. This paper is intended purely as a defence of the Premier. Mr. SEDDON .- My colleague, the Minister for Railways, was mentioned. Mr. PIRANI .- No reference has been made to the expenses of the Minister for Railways- at any rate, in a carping spirit. This return is utterly misleading. Take the trip of the Pre- mier's, to the South Sea Islands: does the Premier mean to say it was not an expense in- curred by himself ? Mr. SEDDON .- No. Mr. PIRANI .- Does he mean to say that the "Tutanekai " was not taken to the South Sea Islands for his personal benefit ? There is a sum of over £1,100 not included in this return. I am not calling into question the propriety of the expenditure at all, but I am pointing this out as an omission in the total of expenses incurred purely for the benefit of the Premier ; and the very title of the book, which was pub- lished by the Premier afterwards-I refer to the first edition, "A Premier in search of Health "-is sufficient to show that was the general impression. Then, there is the cost of printing that book about the South Sea Islands, which is another purely personal matter, and would amount to another £200. Then, we have the cost of that tinsmith's shop, bought to give the Premier a little more fresh air, although every other Minister who lived in that residence was content with the amount of fresh air previously obtainable. That was bought at the rate of £52 per foot, when the land-tax valuation is £26 per foot. Then, we have the increase in the size of the Premier's backyard-which is also a personal expenditure, and which was bought out of the coffers of the State. That should also be included as part of the expenses incurred for the personal benefit of the honourable gentleman as Premier. Then, the Premier talks about the necessity of repairs to the Ministerial residence; but it is not a question of repairs, it is a question of very large additions; and if all the expenditure on the Premier's residence was put down, it would be found that £200 a year would not anything like cover it. It would be impossible to cover the cost of all additions to ground, additions to build- ings and matters of that sort-works that no

<page:1058>

especially for a tenant who paid practically only $200 a year for the privilege of occupying the house and grounds. If the Premier is going into the question of the cost he is to the colony, it would be a simple matter to rake up £4,000 or £5,000 a year which the Premier costs the colony. The colony thinks the Premier cheap at the price, or he would not be continued in office ; and therefore, as the colony thinks that, we members have really no right to growl at the expense. But it is not right to the colony that a statement like this should be laid on the table as the whole of the personal cost of the Premier remaining in the official position he holds at the present time. There . are very many other matters which have not been alluded to, but form part of the expense of having the right honourable gentleman as Premier. There is the fact, for instance, that he has six private secretaries. While His Majesty the King, and the Premier of Eng- land, are satisfied with two private secretaries each, no less than six are required for our Premier. Then, there is another official. I do not know the nature of the title he goes under, but he is in uniform. He is rated as a member of the Permanent Artillery. He is at the sole disposal of the Premier-a guardian of his peace, I suppose. Besides that, I under- stand the Premier has also two messengers at his own disposal, and all these must be added as a part of the expenses of the Premier and his office, just in the same way as salaries, travelling-allowances, and expenses of whatever kind are given; and, if all these details were given in full, I think those members who say the cost of the Premier to the colony- Mr.

SEDDON .- They did not say that; they said that I drew the money. Mr. PIRANI .- Well, money or its equiva- lent. I did not say anything of the sort. In considering the personal cost to the colony of the Premier, 1 maintain that a member who looks at the matter from a fair point of view has a right to take all these expenses into con- sideration. While we are extravagant enough to pay the Governor £7,500, we are not, com- paratively, paying a Premier too much if he incurs expenses amounting to $4,000 or £5,000. The Premier of the colony has much more work to do, and very much more responsibility, and is entitled to something like a decent salary and allowance. I have not called into question the amounts drawn by the Premier, and the expenses of one sort and another incurred by him. But if we are going to have a statement like this-practically a duplicate of another statement that has been laid on the table of the House-and it is intended to show these are the only expenses incurred by the Premier and his suite, it is only fair to the House and the country that the full expenses should be stated. Personally, the greatest objection I take to the return is that the time of the House should be occupied at this stage of the session, with a return laid on the table purely for the purpose of defending some statement made against the Premier. The Premier had an opportunity in | Mr. Pirani suppose he took it. Mr. SEDDON .- I was not here when it was made. Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) .- Sir, I think the member for Palmerston might be content to accept the return laid on the table by the Premier. I lay no special stress on the particular form of the return, but it is per- fectly absurd to suppose that the return re- presents the cost to the country of the Minis- ters and the Ministers' Secretaries. I could place in the hands of any honourable member the draft of a return that would, if complied with, show the actual expenditure of the Minis- try, or of each member of the Ministry, if that were desired; and I am sure the House will believe that that draft would produce the fullest and most satisfactory results when I say that it is in the form of a return of the expenses of the Atkinson Ministry asked for in the House when I was a member of that Ministry. That draft was prepared by the then member for Kumara, who is now Premier of this colony. The honour- able gentleman, I am sure, will understand the full value of the return which he has now presented to the House. Mr. SEDDON (Premier.)-Sir, I think the member for Palmerston was unfair and un- generous in trying to bring in this question of the expense of the "Tutanekai " and the " Hine- moa." Mr. PIRANI .- I did not mention the " Hine- moa." Mr. SEDDON .- Well, the honourable gentle- man mentioned the "Tutanekai." Now, I wish to say that, as far as the visit to the Islands is concerned, the expense should not be charged against me. I think time has proved, by what has taken place, that the colony has been re- couped tenfold the expense of that visit. Then, the honourable member brought in another matter-it is not the first time it has been mentioned, though not in the House-and it is a matter that is much more reprehensible. It is an under-current of statements that I would rather not describe to honourable members. When you have these statements covered, there is no other way of meeting them except to bring documentary evidence to prove the actual amount received by Ministers, and the actual expenses incurred, and certified to by the Pay- master-General and the Accountant ; it is the only way of meeting these statements that are abroad. The member for Palmerston says he deprecates such assertions; but I think the honourable member has probably heard some- thing of the kind himself. He also referred to the taking down of a tinsmith's shop adjoining the Ministerial residence. Well, I wish to teil the House that work in that shop used at times to go on all night-for years it was the same -- and, with the hammering and working at the same time, members may imagine the discomfort that was caused to any one living close by. I never complained ; I never said word to any one. When the occupants kit. the premises they were condemned as being insanitary and unfit for a factory. Then some

<page:1059>

session of them; and I ask honourable mem- bers if it was desirable that valuable Govern- ment property-I leave out of the question the lives involved-should be within 20 ft. of such premises. When the tinsmith was there there was danger of fire. Some nights we were afraid to go to sleep. A portion of the work

consisted in bathing boxes in a cauldron of wax, and it appeared so dangerous that I would not wish members of the House to undergo the anxiety of living next door to such a place. As to the value of the premises and ground, I say that the State has now a property that is worth three times what it cost in the first place. I tell the House, further, that I was accused of placing a certain clause in the Public Works Bill. Now, there is another piece of land on the other side of the section. It has been leased for many years, but if you take the 20 ft. that is leased on the south side of the residence, you come within 15 ft. of the residence and block the light. I say, then, it was necessary to have the power that was given. If the owner had refused to renew the lease, and had built on that section, the residence would have been deprived of its value. Well, I consider that members are in- clined to give to the Premier a house that is free from danger-danger to life and property- and it was only right to place the residence in that position. Now, that is the explanation. As regards the honourable member talking about extending the garden, the garden has not been extended. Mr. Bell wrote offering to lease or to sell that land at the rear of the residence. I say that, in my opinion, it would be a great improvement to the property if that was done ; but before I had time to deal with the matter I left for Australia. The letter reached me just as I was leaving, and when I returned Mr. Bell had sold a portion of the land. Since that both the parties were quite prepared either to sell or to lease to the Government. An Hon. MEMBER .- I did not say they were not. Mr. SEDDON .- The honourable member said that expense had been incurred with a view of compulsorily taking the gardens. I say that no expense was incurred except what was necessary to locate the land, and the result has been that Mr. Chapman, the owner, has sent a letter stating that he was quite prepared to dispose of a portion of the land. A great injustice has been done to me. I have never yet in the course of my life lived on anything but friendly terms with my neighbours. I had not the slightest idea of forcibly taking the land from the owners; but if they were prepared on reasonable terms to sell or lease to the State the land required, as it would be to the advan- tage of the colony, and add to the value of the property, I should have been prepared to deal with them, but not otherwise. An Hon. MEMBER .- Did you not send sur- veyors on the ground ? Mr. SEDDON. - They went to locate the land that had been bought, the land offered by Mr. Bell, and also a section behind the land bought on which the tinsmith's shop stood. We had to get our own land located. When located, and Mr. Bell offered the remainder to us on lease. We could not say where the land was until it was surveyed. The mistake arose because some one had said that we were going to take the land under the Public Works Act. Well, I am not going to be held responsible for what the surveyor or any one else said. I think it is probably as well that the member for Palmerston has brought the matter up, and I thank him for doing so, because it has given me the opportunity of clearing up what might have been considered unneighbourly on my part. I have always all my life lived on the best of terms with my neighbours, and I hope to go on that way to the end, for I do not think a man can be a good man who is a bad neighbour. As regards the matter of Private Secretaries, the honourable member might as well say that all the Secretaries in the departments controlled by me should be charged against the Premier's ex- Can it be said that there is any single penses, Secretary of mine who has not plenty to do, and who does not do work equal to that done by any Secretary in the service? If that could be said, then there might be some good ground for complaint ; but it is monstrous to say that the salaries of these Secretaries should be charged against the Premier's expenses. Then, the honourable member brought in another question, that of messengers; but I am at work, in session and out of session, almost day and night, and if there was but one man on duty all the time he would require to be on duty for eighteen hours a day; and I do not see that I could call upon any man to do duty for eighteen hours a day for £2 8s. a week. Mr. ARNOLD .- If you did you would hear of it. Mr. SEDDON .- If I did I should hear about it; but there is no one attached to me but well earns his money. The honourable mem- ber regretted, in connection with this matter, that it should have come up at this period of the session. Well, Sir, if it is not corrected during the session it will be said that I had the opportunity of correcting these statements when

the House was in session and refrained from doing so. That is why I answer them, even though it is the end of the session. I desire to clear the matter up, and to give in detail every shilling of the amount drawn under the head of " Expenses." If the honourable member says there are other expenses that should be added he is casting a grave reflection upon the Controller and Auditor-General, be- cause this House ordered a return showing the expenses, allowances, and salaries of Ministers, and, the return being to the order of the House, if it is not correct the Auditor-General is responsible for it. The honourable member for Palmerston takes the Controller and Auditor- General as being a final authority, and thinks that it is impossible for him to make mistakes, so that I am sure he would not like to accuse him of having certified to the correctness of an incorrect return. Mr. PIRANI .- I would not mind accusing him if I thought he was wrong.

<page:1060>

wrong in this instance. There was a rumour in circulation to the effect that the Minister for Railways bad drawn over $4,000, and that I have drawn nearly £5,000. Those statements have repeatedly been made. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL .- Where were those statements made ? Mr SEDDON .- You are very cunning. The honourable member is very innocent. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL .- What do you mean by that ? Mr. SEDDON .- I mean that you are very cunning. I cannot refer to a past debate, in which the statement was made, without being called to order. Mr. DEPUTY . SPEAKER. - Honourable members must not address each other. Mr. SEDDON .- I have said that the state- ments were made, and that they are being made now and industriously circulated, but I cannot refer to where they were made without being called to order. The honourable member knows that, and he wants to draw me into stating where this statement was made ; and then he would rise up to a point of order. That is what I meant when I said he was very cunning. The statements being made, I have taken a way of completely vindicating our position ; and, in conclusion, I may say I hope members do not think Ministers do not earn their sala- ries. If I supposed the House and country thought I was not worthy of the amount I receive, and did not give full value for it, then, Sir, I would say they must get somebody else. Sir, I move, That the return be laid on the table. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) .- As a personal explanation, I would say the Premier has contradicted my statement about the lands at the rear of his residence. Here is Mr. Martin Chapman's own statement :- " Speaking for myself, I say that no inquiry whatever was directed to me as to my willing- ness to sell my land. The very first intimation I received that anything was in the wind was the intimation from a Government agent, who told me the Government had resolved to take a piece of my land under the Public Works Act. He was even able to indicate the exact piece. No question of willingness or unwillingness to sell came in. I was informed the Government would take the land. Further, no request or suggestion has ever been made to me that I should sell, or that I should name a price ; and, moreover, I have never named any price, and am not willing to do so." If that statement is not correct that is not my fault. The statement has been published and has never yet been contradicted. Mr. SEDDON .- Well, Sir, I will lay upon the table of the House Mr. Chapman's state- ment in which he offers a price, and with con- ditions which are fair in the extreme. When I heard or saw something in the papers I simply sent for Mr. Chapman; and when Mr. Chapman heard the position he was not aware of what had taken place-he was not aware of the negotiations that had been going on between myself and Mr. Bell at the time that he made after the sending of the letter, and Mr. Bell came to the conclusion that the Government were not going to do anything in the matter. It had been a chapter of accidents. I received a very nice letter from Mr. Bell, in which he said he felt pained at what had appeared in respect to myself ; and I also received a nice letter from Mr. Chapman. I may remark that there was a third party, owning another piece of land. What was done was in the interests of the State. If Ministerial residences are to be called in question, and such charges are to be made against me, then I say that I would rather go out of the Ministerial residence and live in a five-roomed cottage than submit to such things. I will refuse to continue to live in a Ministerial

residence under such conditions. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL .- In reply to an in- terjection, the Premier referred to me as being cunning. I may say that I never made any statement with regard to the amount drawn by the Premier, or his salary, nor with regard to any member of the Government. I also wish to say that, so far as I am aware, no statement has been made in this House during this session by any member that the Premier has drawn £4,000. Mr. SEDDON .- The honourable member knows that I cannot refer to Hansard. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL .- It is wery unfair to put it on all of us without naming the person to whom it applies. Mr. SEDDON .- If I were to refer to the debate I should have to refer to the member making the statement. An Hon. MEMBER .- No. Mr. SEDDON .- It is in Hansard, and if you look at the speeches in the financial debate you will find it there, and under the name of a member who has been termed a "candid friend." Mr. FISHER .- As the Premier has referred to this matter, I indignantly deny that I ever made any statement of the kind just referred to by him. He ought to be compelled to say who he is referring to. Motion agreed to. GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS DEPART- MENT CLASSIFICATION BILL. Sir J. G. WARD (Minister for Railways) .- Sir, this is a very important Bill, and I shall endeavour, in the time I have at my disposal, to place before members the provisions of it. I may preface my remarks by giving honour- able members a slight indication of what the position of the Railway Department is from a financial point of view at the present moment, by comparison with what it was when taken over by the Government of the colony from the Railway Commissioners :- £ Head Office, Departmental, 1894-05. 1901 -- 2. and Traffic 211,935 323,900 .. Maintenance 179,879 251,542 .. Locomotive 138,743 215,416 . . .. Total .. $530,557 £790,867 .. Annual wages increased, £260,310.
<page:1061>
4,500, and the number now employed is 7,793. I think it is only right to say to honourable members that the railway revenue this year, up to the last period for which we have the returns, is still increasing at a phenomenal rate, and it is for a period in which there has been nothing whatever to cause any extraordinary increase of traffic of any kind, and;it should be, therefore, all the more satisfactory to the people of the colony. Now, the increase in our revenue up to date for this year as against last year is £87,352, as compared with £73,488 for the same period of last year. I may say that the last four-weekly period is also £13,863 better than last year, and the last month, to which I have just referred, is about the worst railway month in our experience of the colony ; and I think, under the circum- stances, honourable members will agree that we are justified in making some increase in the ex- penditure of the railways by treating its em- ployes fairly as proposed in this Bill. It is a good guide, when during the month there have been no extraordinary causes or unusual ex- traneous circumstances, such as the Imperial visitors, which would swell the railway revenue in any way, and thus prevent us from seeing the railway revenue of the country in its normal condition ; and it therefore enables us to realise also that it is increasing monthly. I have pointed this out in order to indicate to honourable members what the financial position is, and they can therefore with some degree of safety agree to the increases contained under this Bill. And I ask honourable members, in considering this Bill as a whole, and the pro- posals contained in it, to remember that very important fact in its relation to the increase of £30,000 a year we are proposing to make in the pay of the railway employés. I may inform the House that the Government have on more than one occasion increased the wages of the em- ployés of the various departments, and that the proposals we are now making are not intended to affect the present staff only, but will form the basis of the railway structure of the future in its application to these railway employés. Some honourable members may, in their anxious desire to do more than I now propose, wish to go further than we have gone in this Bill. They must remember that we are making provision for future employés, and that we are laying the basis of the future working of our railways. We shall have to take care that under the railways classification scheme we have a superstructure which in the future will bring about the most beneficial results, and be the means of doing away with many anomalies which might lead to grave injustice being done to the railway

employés themselves. As I have stated to the House earlier in the session, this Bill has been before the two important divisions of the Railway service, who have had an opportunity of considering its application and bearing upon themselves; and I might say that in conference with me both divisions have agreed to the proposals contained in this Bill as being, on the whole, acceptable to them. I have had the assurance of these two divisions proposals. In regard to the second division of the service, after going into the various details at considerable length they have cordially and frankly stated they are prepared to accept the proposals contained in this Bill as being satis- factory to them. One of the matters brought before me was this: Honourable members know that in connection with the Railway service we have an Appeal Board, and the proposal was made that the power and authority of the Appeal Board should super- sede the responsible Minister of the day -that is, that the decision of the Appeal Board should be final. Well, that was a matter I could not agree to, and I explained why, as I shall explain to honourable members. There must be a responsible head, and there must be some one responsible to the people of the country; and if the responsibility in con- ducting the Railway service was taken away from those who control the affairs of the colony and handed over to any one who was not respon- sible to the colony you would require to super- sede the Minister himself. That will show how impossible it would be to give effect to such a proposal. It has been my experience that, in connection with the running of the trains in some portions of the colony, accidents have hap- pened in which drivers, firemen, and others have been involved, and, as the result of appeals to the Appeal Board, the recommendation in one instance, at any rate, came before me that the engine-driver should be reinstated in his former position. Mr. T. MACKENZIE .- Was that Hughes ? Sir J. G. WARD .- No; I do not want to mention names, because I do not want to in- jure any man either in the service or who has left it if I can avoid it. The responsi- 4.0. bility in that case, as in all cases of the lives of the people who travel, and who form a very large section of the community and con- tribute a very large amount of revenue to the railways of the colony, is not upon the mem- bers of the Appeal Board ; it is upon the responsible head of the department. In the first place, the responsibility of the proper arrangements for their safety is on the head of the executive officers. There are also grave responsibilities upon the head of the men them- selves, who might, in the event of an accident happening where death resulted, be charged with manslaughter ; but the final responsibility is on the Ministerial head of the department, and therefore it is impossible, no matter what pressure is brought to bear upon the Minister who is carrying on the railways of the country, to hand over such a responsibility to any Board. When I placed these views before those making the request they readily agreed that there was reason on the side of the Government for the position they took up. Then, again, the ques- tion has arisen as to what rights those who are termed casual hands should have with regard to the Appeal Board. There have been in the employment of every department of the colony a large number of casual hands, and it is only right, when we are dealing with the permanent

<page:1062>

disputes arise as to their positions and pro- motions and transfers, where an injustice might unintentionally or otherwise be done, to seek redress, that the casual hands, many of whom are really permanent hands, should have an opportunity, after a certain term of employ- ment, of having their cases also tried before the Appeal Board. There is nothing upon this head contained in the Bill, but it is necessary to have regulations, and I propose in the regulations to give these casual employés who have been in the department four years the same right- An Hon. MEMBER .- Make it three. Sir J. G. WARD .- No, I cannot. I propose to do something better in another direction- to go to the Appeal Board as permanent hands. It is, I think, right that there should be a pro- portion of permanent hands definitely stated, so that we may know where we are in this matter, and I have informed the representa- tives of both divisions that I am quite pre- pared to fix definitely, by regulations, the proportion of permanent hands to the propor- tion of casual hands, and give the remaining casual hands in the service for four

years and upwards the right to go to the Appeal Board. I say that is a great step forward, to fix definitely the number of permanent hands, and also to give the casuals the benefit of going to the Appeal Board, and I am sure it will give universal satisfaction throughout the Railway service of the colony. Now, in connection with another matter, I might say that this Bill removes the old system of age restriction, both as re- gards cleaners and porters. That has been & source of very great dissatisfaction and almost universal complaint amongst those concerned in the Railway Department. Under the former system, having the age restriction, it was possible, and actually happened, that a young fellow who went on as a cleaner might have attained to eighteen years of age, and have been in the service a couple of years. But, owing to the age-limit, he might find some one who was appointed after him and who was two months older, and because of these two months difference in age the one appointed perhaps two years earlier would find himself placed junior to the new man, although, as I say, he had been in the service two years before him. That was most unjust, and I had no power to alter it. Members will find the same occurred with porters. An Hon. MEMBER. - It is the same with machinists. Sir J. G. WARD .- I have removed all that under this Bill, so as not to allow the age- limit to interfere in any way with the years of service. There ought not to be that restriction, which in practice has worked very unsatisfac- torily, has given a very great deal of trouble to every one concerned, and has caused many heartburnings and injustices to be perpetrated. Under the former system young fellows who had been one, two, and three years in the service often found themselves superseded by some one Sir J. G. Ward them, simply because of the age restriction. This Bill entirely removes that, and I have no hesitation in saying it will inspire the young men in the service with a great deal of hope, and will give satisfaction throughout the colony. Then, again, under the former system the method of transfers from the No. 2 to No. 1 Division was very unsatisfactory. I propose, in connection with the railway employés of the colony, that a member of the No. 2 Division can obtain a transfer to the Clerical Division after he has been in the service for six years. There must be a period of years fixed, otherwise we would have much confusion. An Hon. MEMBER .- That is not in the Bill. Sir J. G. WARD .-- No; I do not propose to put that clause in the Bill. The working of the Railways Act to a very large extent will re- quire to be carried out by regulations. These regulations, in the usual way, when prepared. will be gazetted for general information ; and so also the information in regard to the Appeal Board and to the casual employés, and relative to the transfer from the Second to the Clerical Division, will require to be done in the way I have indicated. There is no other practical way to do it. What we propose in this Bill is that a boy who enters as cleaner or porter, or any other capacity . at all in the many avenues of employment in the Railway Department, should have an opportunity, and will have an oppor- tunity, of becoming the General Manager of the Railways if he has the capacity and ability so to do. It is only right to give the railway employés -the juniors-encouragement, and to inspire them with hope ; and I say that if we get boys of ability-brainy boys, coming on, it matters not from however humble a walk of life-it is only right that they should have an oppor- tunity of attaining to the highest position in the Railway service of the colony. That is now made possible under the Bill. It was not pos- sible before. Our boys, therefore, by good be- haviour, industry, and ability, and by exercis- ing their abilities assiduously, have the highest positions in the service open to them. Their future depends upon themselves. There is one matter in the Schedule, on pages 3 and 4, to which I wish to briefly refer. It has been brought under my notice that, in proposing to have three grades in Class 2 of both the Loco motive and Maintenance Departments, an in- justice might be done to outside workers by fix ing a third grade. In deference to the represen- tations made on this point I propose to delete from the two classes to which I have referred the third grade, and that will remove an ob- jection which was entertained by some mem- bers, and which was brought under my notice by the honourable member for Dunedin City (Mr. Millar) in the first instance, and further brought before me by the honourable member for Wellington Suburbs and the member for Dunedin City (Mr. Arnold) and other members. It was put in in the first instance so as to insure, if possible, in the future that

the work of the Railway service of the colony might be somewhat graded in these particular classes.
<page:1063>
partment, in the particular walks of the me- chanical world referred to, two grades apply, and I think it is only right that a similar sys- tem should prevail in the Railway service ; and, holding this view, I am glad to be able to now inform the House that I fully concur in having two grades only in this department, and I will amend it accordingly. I should now like to explain to honourable members what are the effects of this Bill in some of its more import- ant details, as it is only right they should have some idea of what it proposes to do. The Schedule to this Bill provides for increased salaries to District and Workshop Managers, Locomotive and Maintenance Engineers, clerks, draftsmen, auditors, boiler inspectors, store- keepers, running - shed foremen, foremen of works, inspectors of permanent-way, workshop foremen, car and wagon inspectors, coaching, goods, and wharf foremen, bridge inspectors, shop foremen, and timber checkers. Clerical Staff. Present Proposed Scale. Scale. £ Cadets -1st year 30 40 2nd . 40 50 3rd 50 60 . 70 60 4th 5th 75 85 100 6th 90 100 Clerks - 7th 110 110 8th 120 9th 130 120 130 10th 140 11th . 140 150 . 140 160 12th 170 13th .. 140 180 14th 150 Under the proposed scale a member will receive #190 more during the first fourteen years than under the existing scale. Clerks and Draftsmen. Proposed Scale. Present Scale. Class abolished. £160, rising to £180 in three years. £190, rising to £220 in £190, rising to £220 in three years. three years. £235, rising to £250 in £230, rising to £250 in two years. one year. £260, rising to £300 in £260, rising to £300 in three years. four years. £315, rising to £350 in £315, rising to £355 in three years. three years. £370, rising to £400 in £375, rising to $400 in two years. two years. Chief Clerk, Head Office, proposed scale, £425, rising to $500 in four years. Under proposed scale engineering and drafting cadets will re- ceive $10 per annum more than clerical cadets, or £20 more than under existing scale; and clerical cadets will, by passing Junior and Senior Civil Service and shorthand examina- tions, be able to obtain allowances equal to two years' service, as against three months for .shorthand only, as at present. Proposed Scale. Present Scale: Ist subclass, 1st grade. £250 and £40 house £315, rising to £355 in allowance, rising to three years, house- £300 in fifteen years. rent not exceeding $50 per annum being deducted. Ist subclass, 2nd grade. £220 and £35 house $260, rising to £300 in allowance, rising to three years, house- £230 in five years. rent not exceeding £40 per annum being deducted. 2nd subclass. £200 and $35 house £235, rising to £250 in allowance, rising to one year, house-rent £210 in five years. not exceeding £35 per annum being de- 3rd subclass. ducted. £180 and £30 house allowance, rising to £190, rising to £220 in £190 in five years. three years, house- rent not exceeding 4th subclass. £25 per annum being £160 and $25 house deducted. allowance, rising to £170 in five years. £170, rising to £180 in one year, house-rent 5th subclass. not exceeding £20 £140 and $25 house per annum being de- allowance, rising to ducted. £150 in five years. This is how it is proposed that amended classification schedule should affect Subdivi- sion 2-salaried staff not otherwise specified : 1st grade, £600 to £650: Railway Accountant, Traffic Superintendents, Inspecting Engineer. 2nd grade, £520 to £575: Locomotive Engi- neers, Hurunui-Bluff and Wellington-Napier- New Plymouth Sections. 3rd grade, £425 to $500 : Chief Clerk, Head Office ; Stores Man- ager, District Traffic Managers, District Engi- neers. 4th grade, $370 to $400: Chief Clerk (Accountant's Branch), Chief Draftsmen, Dis- trict Traffic Managers, District Engineers, Loco- motive Engineers, Workshop Managers. 5th grade, £315 to £355 (Stationmasters provided with houses to pay rental not exceeding £50 per annum) : Clerks, draftsmen, Stationmasters and Goods Agents now paid $250 to £300 and house, Chief Traffic Auditor, boiler inspectors, running - shed foremen, District Engineers, Locomotive Engineers, Workshop Managers. 6th grade, $260 to $300 (Stationmasters pro- vided with houses to pay rental not exceeding £40 per annum) : Clerks, draftsmen, Station- masters and Goods Agents now paid £220 to .9230 and house, Audit Inspectors, Traffic In- spectors, running-shed foremen, foremen of works, electrical mechanician, signalling and interlocking inspectors and foremen, inspectors of permanent-way, inspectors of bridge -

con- struction, storekeepers, District Managers, assistant engineers, Workshop Managers. 7th grade, $235 to $250 (Stationmasters provided with houses to pay rental not exceeding $35 per annum) : Clerks, draftsmen, Stationmasters
<page:1064>
Audit Inspectors, storekeepers, Traffic In- spectors, workshop foremen, boiler inspec- tors, car and wagon inspectors, running- shed foremen, foremen of works, electri- cal mechanicians, signalling and interlocking inspectors and foremen, inspectors of per- manent - way, inspectors of bridge - construc- tion, assistant engineers. 8th grade, £190 to £220 (Stationmasters provided with houses to pay rental not exceeding £25 per annum) : Clerks, draftsmen, Stationmasters at unimport- ant 3rd subclass stations now paid £180 to £190 and house, Stationmasters now paid £160 to £170 and house, and most important of those now paid £140 to £150 and house, coaching, goods, and wharf foremen, workshop foremen, car and wagon inspectors, running-shed fore- men, foremen of works, electrical mechani- cians, signalling and interlocking inspectors and foremen, inspectors of permanent - way, inspectors of bridge-construction, bridge in- spectors, shop foremen. 9th grade, £110 to £180 (Stationmasters provided with houses to pay rental not exceeding £20 per annum) : Clerks, draftsmen, Stationmasters now at unimport- ant 5th subclass stations at £140 to £150 and house, salary to be £170 to £180 without house ; coaching, goods, and wharf foremen, timber- checkers, timber inspectors. Second Division .- Class 1 : Traffic. Present Pay. Proposed Pay. Guards, Grade 1. 9s., rising to 10s. after | 9s., rising to 10s. after seven years. two years. Brakesmen. 8s. to 8s. 6d. Now classed as guards, Grade 2, 8s. to 8s. 6d., and have, therefore, advantage of rising to 1st grade guard under percentages. Signalmen, Grades 1 and 2. The same under present and proposed schedules. Signalmen, Grade 3. 7s. to 7s. 6d. 7s. 6d. (Signalmen in charge of important signal-cabins, 18. per day additional.) Signalmen : Percentages (improved under new Bill). Grade 1-25 per cent. Grade 1-30 per cent. Grade 2-45 Grade 2-40 Storemen, Grade 1. \- 88\. 6d. 9s., rising to 10s. after two years. Storemen, Grade 2. 8s. - 8s., rising to 8s. 6d. after one year. Storemen, Grade 3. 7s. to 7s. 6d. 7s. 6d. - Percentages. Grade 1-30 per cent. | Grade 1-20 per cent. Grade 2-30 Grade 2-40 Horsedrivers. Grade 1. The 50-per-cent. limit \- .. removed. \- Sir J. G. Ward 7s. to 78. 6d. 7s. 6d. 1 Labourers. 6s. 6d. 7s. 1 Shunters. Head-shunters-9s. to | Term " head-shunters" 108. abolished; now Grade 1, 9s. to 10s. Grade 1-88. 6d. Grade 2-8s. to 8s. 6d. Grade 2-8s. Grade 3-7s. to 7s. 6d. Grade 3-7s. 6d. Percentages. Now four head-shun- Grade 1-10 per cent., ters. equal to twelve on basis of present num- ber of shunters. Grade 1-10 per cent. Grade 2-30 per cent. Grade 2-20 Porters, Grade 1. 78\. to 7s. 6d. - 7s. 6d. Porters, Grade 2. 6s. to 6s. 6d. - 6s. to 7s., after one year. \- Junior Porters. 3s. 6d. 1 4s. Class 2 : Locomotive. Principal Leading Tradesmen. 10s. 6d. to 11s. - (Including pattern- makers, moulders, coppersmiths, tin- smiths) 11s. to 12s. Other Leading Hands. 9s. 6d. - 108. Tradesmen. 8s. to 10s. (Including sailmakers and moulders, paint- ers, trimmers, and tinsmiths), Grade 1, 10s. to 10s. 6d ; Grade 2, 9s. to 9s. 6d. Improvers. "Improvers" struck out and " Junior trades- men " substituted. Under the old regula- tions apprentices were engaged up to 104 years of age, and some of them could not, therefore, complete five years of apprentice- ship before expiry of indentures at the age of twenty-one. (Junior Tradesmen). 6s. 6d. to 7s. 6d. 7s. 6d. to 8s. 1 Machinists' Strikers. Sailmakers, Holders-up, and Fettlers, Grade 1. 7s. 6d to 8s. Ss. 6d. \- Grade 2. 7s. Ss. 1 Grade 3. 7s. 6d. \- Sailmakers now classed as tradesmen (9s. to 10s. 6d.) Furnacemen and Helpers, Grade 1. 8s. to 9s. Ss. 6d. to 9s. 6d. 1
<page:1065>
Grade 2. 7s. to 7s. 6d. 8s. \- Leading Labourers. 88. 6d. 8s. 1 Labourers. Grade 2-7s. Skilled, 8s. Grade 3-6s. 6d. Skilled, 7s. 6d. Labourers, 78. Skilled labourers are labourers assisting fitters and erectors, men taking down and setting up machinery and work requiring a certain amount of mechanical skill, &c. Cleaners. 3s. 6d. 48\. Shop Enginemen. 7s. 6d. to 8s., although 7s. 6d. to 9s. not shown in the Schedule.

Locomotive Running Storemen. (Not shown), 7s. and 7s. 6d. to 8s. 78. 6d. Train Examiners. 8s. 6d. 88\. 1 Lifters. 7s. to 7s. 6d. 78. 6d. to 88. 6d. In the three grades, 6d. rise all round. Coalmen. 68\. 6d. 7s. (When in charge of special gang, 1s. per day additional.) Junior Strikers, &c. 3s. 6d. \- 4s. Maintenance. Principal Leading Tradesmen. 9s. 6d. to 11s. 11s. to 12s. 1 Leading Painters and Plumbers. 9s. 6d. to 10s. 10s. 6d. 1 Masons and Bricklayera. Maximum, 11s. Maximum now, 11s. 6d. Tradesmen now, Tradesmen, 8s. to 10s. 9s. to 10s. 6d. Bridgemen. \- 7s. 6d. 7s. Strikers. 7s. 6d. to 8s. 6d. 7s. 1 Line Gangers in charge of Special Work. Os. 6d. 10s. 1 Gangers. 7s. 6d. to 9s. 8s. to 10s. (Grade 3, 7s. 6d., abolished) (Gangers in subclass 10. residing in isolated places, 6d. per day additional.) Platelayers in charge of Relaying Gangs. 7s. 6d. 78\. 1 Platelayers 6s. 6d. 7s. 1 Junior Platelayers and Junior Labourers. 3s. 6d. 4s., rising to 7s. in four annual increments of 6d. and one of 1s. Junior surfacemen in relaying gangs 6d. a day additional ; for- merly nothing. Subclass 14 and 15 .- Electrical and Inter- locking Branch. (This is a new branch.) Subclass 14. - Signal - adjusters : Grade 1, 11s. 6d. to 12s. (one annual increment of 6d. per day) ; Grade 2, 11s. Signal - erectors : Leading hands, 11s. ; Grade 1, 10s. ; Grade 2, 9s. ; Grade 3, 8s. ; Grade 4, 7s. 6d. ; Grade 5, 7s. Subclass 15 .- Electric-line men : Grade 1, 11s. ; Grade 2, 108. Electric-line erectors : Lead- ing hands, 9s. ; Grade 1, 8s. ; Grade 2, 7s. 6d. ; Grade 3, 7s. I have now referred generally to the more im- portant alterations contained in the Bill, and I may say, for the information of honour- able members, that the classification proposed in this Bill is much simpler and is much better than the existing classification. It also removes many of the difficulties that existed under the former classification. I cannot, of course, go fully into the whole of the details now, because time will not permit. Many of the matters brought before me by railway em- ployés were reasonable, and I have endeavoured to reasonably meet the requests of the deputa- tions. As Minister for Railways I am only too glad to make the most workable and satisfactory classification possible, and my desire is to do what is fair and just to all branches of the de- partment as well as to individual members of it. I must at the same time conserve the in- terests of the colony. I regard the trust placed in my hands as a great one, and my anxious desire is, to the best of my ability, to control and administer it justly and impartially. It is of the highest importance to the colony that justice should be extended to so important a body of men as are to be found in the Railway service. I am sure that no one would be better pleased than myself if it had been possible to propose an even more liberal classification than this one. The Amalgamated Society of Rail- way Employés number some three thousand five hundred members, and the First Division is comprised of some thirteen hundred officers. They have assured me that they are satisfied with the proposals. In this measure I have endeavoured to do that which is just to the men, and I feel sure that honourable members will recognise that the acquiescence of the two important branches I have referred to shows the scheme has been framed in that spirit. As I have indicated, this scheme will give a considerable amount of benefit to a most deserving class-namely, the officers of the First Division in the colony. That divi- sion consists of thirteen hundred employés, and they have expressed their approval of the classification scheme. Under the cir-
<page:1066>
agreeing, I can with great confidence ask honourable members to assent to this scheme, and to assist to place it on the statute-book. By so doing they will, in my opinion, be doing that which is alike beneficial to the railway employés as a whole and also to the colony, as a contented and self-respecting service, recog. nising that the State is treating it fairly, must give better results to our country. In con- clusion, I say that in this colony we have a splendid Railway service - a service con- taining men in all branches who do the colony a great deal of credit. I may say that in travelling in different parts of the world, and keeping one's eyes open - and without saying anything to derogate from the ability of the men whom I have seen discharging railway duties in other parts of the world-I say that the intelligence of the railway em- ployés of this colony is second to none ; and what I propose in this Bill will now and for some years hence confer upon them many ad- vantages that do not exist in other countries, and it embodies, I think, a fair rate of

pay in the different branches of the Railway service. I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of the Bill. Mr. WILFORD (Wellington Suburbs). - I wish to make some suggestions to the Minister, and I may say that I do not rise in a spirit of hostile criticism, but rather with the idea of putting something before the honourable gentle- man from the standpoint of a number of the railway employés in the district I represent. I want first to congratulate the Minister upon the introduction of this Bill, because I am sure it is a step in the right direction, and I am quite sure that many classes of the railway service will be benefited by the alterations in the Schedule; but there are certain other alterations which I think are necessary in the interests of the workers. In the first place, I wish it to be clearly understood that I do not propose to devote myself to the First Division at all. I propose to deal with the workers-that is to say, those who are in the Maintenance, Locomotive, and Traffic branches, apart from the clerical staff. . As far as the clerical divi- sion is concerned, I do not intend to deal with them, because they are quite able to take care of themselves. Those who have to be looked after are the working-men in the different branches of the service. I want to point out to the Minister what the workmen in my electorate consider would be a reasonable amendment to make in clause 2 of the Bill. Honourable members will understand that the only officers which this Bill refers to are the permanent members of the Railway Service. The definition of "permanently employed in the service of the department " is not capable of two interpretations. It means simply per- manently employed in the department. I have on other occasions condemned the system of employing what are termed permanent casuals in this and other branches of the service. I know of men who have been twenty years in the railway workshops, and they are still 3rd Sir J. G. Ward which they can rise to a higher grade. For instance, the labourers in the railway work- shops are graded now into certain classes-into second and third classes. To my mind the present arrangement is absurd. It is absurd to have a third-class labourer who does the same work as a second-class labourer ; and, as a matter of fact, those men who are not first- class labourers under the present conditions are no class at all, so far as labourers are concerned. The Minister has swept away third-class tradesmen, and surely third-class labourers should be swept away also, because this class is an anomaly, is not required. and to my mind is meaningless. I would suggest that the following amendment be made in the interpretation : "permanently employed in the service of the department, or any person who has been employed continuously in the work of the department for three years." Of course, it may be ruled that such an amend- ment cannot be moved by a private member because it will increase the amount of expen- diture by the Government. My opinion is that something should be done to put the officers who are termed permanent casuals on a proper footing. I may state to honourable members how far the present system goes. There is one department in the railway workshops at Petone in which twenty-four or twenty-five men are engaged, and they are presided over by one officer, and I can assure members that the only permanent hand in that department is the foreman. All the rest are casuals. The prin- ciple upon which the Government act in regard to this matter is this: That when a permanez: hand is dismissed or dies, his place is filled up by the appointment of a casual hand, and the result will be, if this system is continued much longer, that the whole of the men employed in a department will be casuais. We have got now a permanent head, and the only permanent man is the leading hand, wb.' has to show the new men how to get to work. and to instruct them in their work. He hs. been fifteen years in that position, and 15 qualified to act as a carpenter, for which be would receive 10s. 6d. a day instead of os. to. But the foreman of the whole branch maker him the leading hand, and the foreman has ar objection to his leaving that position. He says "You have been sixteen years in that positicr. and you are perfect in this particular branch. and I cannot replace you." And this man ha: stood years and years in exactly the same class. I know he has had a promise from one Minis. ter-I believe before the present Ministry came into office-that he would get a rise, but notbier has been done. I have brought this matter before the Hon. the Minister and the Gener .. Manager of Railways, but the answer. which is a perfectly legitimate one, has been tha :. graded as they

are, there is no possibility of classing this man otherwise. Then. the leading hands in the workshops are leadni hands in name only. They may do work for various men under them, and, although they do leading tradesman's work, they are classed
<page:1067>
give them the authority they should have, nor the pride that should be instilled into the mind of every man who is trying to make his way up. I believe clause 25 is a good and generous clause. It is the clause which allows any man, no matter what grade, or class, or department of the service he may be in, to reach the position of General Manager, or, as was aptly interjected by an honourable mem- ber, it gives him the opportunity of climbing from log cabin to White House. That is a posi- tion I congratulate the honourable the Minister in regard to. Then, there is the constitution of the Appeal Board, and I wish to draw the atten- tion of the Minister to something that might arise in connection with the constitution of this Appeal Board. Clause 13 deals with it, and it appoints the Board as follows : One man, who is a Stipendiary Magistrate or a District Court Judge, is to be President of the Court, and, under subclauses (2) and (3), one person is to be elected by the members of the First Division in the North Island and Middle Island re- spectively from among their number, and one to be elected by the members of the Second Division in the aforesaid islands respectively from among their number. It is true this seems to be a very difficult matter to arrange ; but I should like to allow a man in the work- shops, or in some way to appoint a man outside the workshops to sit on the Board. I put this matter before a gathering of the workshop men and the departments, and they saw at once the anomaly that might arise. Supposing, for the sake of argument, a guard on our section here was appointed one of the members of the Appeal Board for this island. That guard is under the Stationmaster ; the Stationmaster is his superior officer. And suppose the superior officer-the Stationmaster - inflicted a penalty under another section of this Act on another guard. Now, if this other guard wanted to appeal he would go to the Appeal Board and be tried by his fellow-guard, who might reverse the decision of his own superior officer, the Station- master. That is a position that might crop up at any time. It might apply to any grade or department of the railway workshops, and the suggestion I offer to the Minister to adopt is this : The railway workshops men say that there are practically two branches of the Second Division-there is the mechanical department, and the locomotive traffic and maintenance de- partment, and what they say is this: that it is impossible to have a man from the locomotive, traffic, and maintenance departments sitting on the Appeal Board to hear an appeal from some man who had been aggrieved in the other de- partment, and vice versa. Now, I would suggest that the word "one " should be struck out, and the word "two " put in, so that the subsection would read : "Two persons to be elected by the members of the First Division in the North Island and Middle Island respectively from among their number, one of whom shall be elected from the mechanical branch of the service, and the other from the loco- motive, traffic, and maintenance departments." sary for a man to try other men outside his own department, otherwise you might have the foreman of a particular branch mulcting in some form of penalty a man under him, and that man might have to appeal to one of his brother workers and have the decision reversed. I merely put this matter to the Minister with all deference just as a suggestion. Now, I must congratulate the Hon. the Minister, on behalf of my constituency, on clauses 6 and 7. My constituents believe it is right that from the classification there shall be prepared and laid before Parliament each year a list setting out the names, status, and pay of each member, and the number of years he has been in the service ; but they say that in clause 7 the words "whether he is or is not entitled thereto " should be struck out, and there should be added to the end of the clause: "and any member shall be entitled at all reasonable times to peruse or obtain a copy of the folios of such conduct-book relating to himself." They say they may be " hauled up on the carpet " for some offence, and their conduct-book pro- duced ; and they then find there are black marks against their names that they had no knowledge of at all, and these black marks might be against their names for

something that had oc- curred too long ago for them to be able to rebut any charges that may have been brought against them. Now, in regard to the Second Schedule, as to the classification of the men, is there any justification for classing machinists, at any rate, lower than sailmakers? I believe in the sail- makers being raised, and I do not want to see any reduction or levelling down ; and let these men-who are a grand lot of men, as the Minis. ter and the whole country admit-have the benefit of the prosperity which they are helping themselves to maintain in this colony. The class of work they do in the workshops has been admired, and has been recognised as good work, and it is not necessary to emphasize that, or to say anything further in regard to the matter at all. But why should the Minister put a man who is a machinist, I was going to say, lower than a sailmaker, lower than a riveter, and lower than a borer, blacksmith, turner, or copper-smith ? Now, what is the position of a machinist ? There is not any very great num- ber of them, and it is not a tremendous amount that is involved. Here is the position that I want to show: I have in my hand a table of statistics of wages paid in the Old Country, and I am producing this not to show \------- the amount that is paid, but the classing and grading of the different departments. I am producing this for the purpose of showing that in the Old Country-I am not saying that the wages paid in the Old Country should be paid here-that fitters, smiths, turners, planers, borers and slotters, and millers, are all graded the same. Now they are graded as receiv- ing the same amount of pay. I put this before some of the gentlemen who have juris- diction in this matter when discussing this question, and they contradicted me when I said all these classes would receive the same

<page:1068>

convinced them, from the table I have here, that it is so. Now, if the standard wages are the same in these particular classes of the department, why should we tend to lower the status of one class? Is it a fair or reasonable thing? Should we here, in this country, at- tempt to lower the status of one particular class of servants ? I say, No; and consequently I hope, in the very near future, that the Hon. the Minister will take steps to place machinists in the same position as sailmakers or riveters. Now, let me pass on to a document which has gone forth in this country in reference to black- smiths. It was issued on the 16th July, 1900, and bears the signature of T. Ronayne, General Manager, and reads as follows :- "New Zealand Government Railways. " Head Office, Wellington, 16th July, 1900. "SIR,-With reference to petition signed by yourself and other blacksmiths employed in the railway workshops at Hillside for an increase of pay, I have the honour to inform you that it has been decided to grant an increase of 6d. per day to all competent blacksmiths. "A further increase of 6d. per day will be granted twelve months hence to those who can be recommended by their foreman, provided that the outside rates are maintained. "These increments will bring the rate for blacksmiths up to 11s. per day ; and will, with few exceptions, mean an increase of 6d. per day for the current period .- I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant, "T. RONAYNE, General Manager." That is addressed to the Secretary of the railway workshops in the different towns. That advance has not been given, and I feel quite sure that the Minister only wants his attention drawn to it, and to be reminded that the General Manager sent that circular out, to have the omission rectified. Now, the Minister has saved a lot of discussion by putting up sub- class 2 of class 2 in the Schedule-that is, in regard to painters and plumbers. The painting trade was badly paid. It was paid at a rate altogether incommensurate with the rate of wages fixed outside by the Arbitration Court, and the Minister has seen that and put it right, and consequently there was no need to say any- thing more in regard to the matter. Now, let me say a word or two with regard to the strikers and the age-limit. The age-limit in regard to the strikers is absolutely prejudicial to a man getting a proper return for the work he is doing. I have at the present time in my mind's eye a young fellow employed in the Petone Workshops, and a constituent of mine. He stands 6 ft. 2 in., is a champion athlete, and as strong as a horse ; but on account of this age-limit he is not able to get anything more than the minimum wage, and although he is not married -being a young fellow-he helps to support his mother and his two sisters. I brought his case

before the Minister, and I thought something would have been done in the direction of doing away with the age-limit alto- gether. This young fellow is carrying-on the Mr. Wilford work-and he has done it for many years-he is entitled to rank as a striker, where the circum- stances are ordinary, as they are here, even in the bottom grade. May I ask the Minister how does a man in the ordinary classes of these workshops get from the third to the first grade ? It is by the recommendation of the foreman, is it not ? It is a slow process, and a man may stay in these workshops fifteen years in grade three. He may stay any length of time as a permanent casual and get a low rate of wages ; and he will get under the Classification Act here the lowest grade, and may never get out of it. Now, what is the ordinary policy ? The foreman, who is over a certain number of men, does not feel disposed to recommend every man in the particular branch, and to take them out of that grade we should do away with the third grade. The wages of 7s. 6d. per day for some trades are altogether too low compared with the rate of wages fixed by the Arbitration Court outside the work- shops; and surely the Government is not going to set a status of low wages, but, rather, a status of high wages. I ask the Minister not to go in for any squandering, but simply to bring this Schedule of the Bill into line with the same classes of trade outside the shops. We know that the Minister of Railways is a bold man. He is not afraid to tackle a big thing, as we have seen ; and that is why his success is so assured, and why he is considered such a generous Minister by the employés of the colony. He has been prepared to grapple with this question, and I congratulate him most heartily in regard to what he has done in the Bill. I hope he will not take these sugges- tions from me in any hostile spirit, but as & desire on my part to help him to perfect this classification scheme. I thank the Minister for having increased the pay of Stationmasters. It was becoming a public scandal in the colony that these Stationmasters had no increase of wages, and no chance of rising in their posi- tion from a monetary point of view, and to my idea the reason that the rise has not been given before is that the request had not the weight of combined action. Combined action is the only thing the Government of the country recognises. The action of one in- dividual is taken notice of only to a certain extent, but "Unity is Strength " all the world over. I congratulate the Minister for having introduced that amendment. I have nothing more to say in regard to the Bill now. I thank honourable members for having been so patient with me. I wish to put these suggestions before them on behalf of the workers, and, even if the Minister cannot see his way to carry them out this session, I trust he will extend to me and the men in my district the same courtesy that he has in the past. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) .- I do not desire to prolong discussion on this measure, because I have an earnest wish it should become law this session. At the same time I congratulate the Minister on the improvement on the classification scheme in force, and I hope that at no distant date he will be able to see his

<page:1069>

employés who do not quite receive the recogni- tion that they ought to receive under the pro- posals in the Bill before us. Sir J. G. WARD (Minister for Railways) .- Sir, I am quite prepared to give the several matters referred to by the member for Wel- lington Suburbs the fullest consideration. I recognise that one very important matter which he has referred to in the course of his speech is that of enabling the two branches of the Railway service to have a different repre- sentation on the Appeal Board. I have already given the matter a good deal of consideration, and I am not satisfied that the present system is the best. I think there is a great deal in what the honourable member said, and I am quite prepared to look into the matter, and, if it is possible, to effect a change in this Bill-I do not want to jeopardize the passage of the Bill- to have a representative from the Locomotive branch and from the Maintenance and Traffic branch, so that the respective branches might be represented on the Appeal Board. I will consider the matter, and when I finally decide as to the best course to follow I will have the Bill amended in the Legislative Council. Regarding the other questions referred 5.0 to by the honourable member, I am afraid that, generally speaking, they will require to be deferred for future consideration. The maximum amount of increase

under this Bill is, in round numbers, £30,000. I am limited to that amount, and consequently any alterations which would increase that amount would bring the sum beyond that for which I can ask the authority of the House. I desire to thank honourable members for the way in which they have received the Bill. I am glad to know, by the personal expressions of opinion of members to me, and also by the absence of speeches from honourable members, which speaks volumes for their good wishes for the measure, that they desire to see this important measure become law. Bill read a second time. # IN COMMITTEE. Clause 13 .- " For the purpose of the depart- ment an Appeal Board is hereby constituted for the North Island and the Middle Island respectively, each of which Boards (hereinafter called ' the Board ') shall consist of the fol- lowing persons, that is to say :- "(1.) A Judge of the District Court, or a Stipendiary Magistrate, to be ap- pointed from time to time by the Governor, and to be the Chairman of the Board ; " (2.) One person to be elected by the mem- bers of the First Division in the North Island and Middle Island respectively from among their num- ber ; and "(3.) One person to be elected by the mem- bers of the Second Division in the aforesaid Islands respectively from among their number." (2), to strike out the words " respectively from among their number." The Committee divided on the question, "That the words proposed to be omitted be retained." AYES, 40. Allen, E. G. Fowlds Parata Allen, J. Fraser, A. L. D. Seddon Arnold Gilfedder Smith, G. J. Graham Barclay Stevens Hall Bennet Tanner Buddo Hall-Jones Thompson, R. Carncross Heke Thomson, J. W. Carroll Ward Hogg McGuire Collins Wilford Willis. Mckenzie, R. Colvin Duncan McNab Millar Ell Tellers. Fisher Mills Hornsby Palmer Russell, G. W. Flatman NOES, 13. Hardy Massey Symes. Herries .Monk O'Meara Tellers. Hutcheson Rhodes Guinness Lang Russell, W. R. Pirani. Lawry Majority for, 27. Amendment negatived. Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) moved, in subsection (3), to strike out the word " one," and to insert in lieu thereof the word "two." Amendment negatived, and clause agreed to. Mr. GUINNESS (Grey) moved the following new subsection :- "All evidence shall be reduced to writing, and the deposition of each witness shall be signed by him." Sir J. G. WARD (Minister for Railways) moved, That progress be reported. Progress reported. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) moved, That the committal of the Bill be made the third order of the day. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) moved, That the committal of the Bill be made the second order of the day. Mr. SEDDON said the House had already ordered that the Bill should be Order No. 3, and he was simply wishing to put the measure back in its proper place. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER said the House could at any time order at what period of a sit- ting a Bill should be brought on. The House divided on the ques- 5.30. tion, "That the word 'third' be re- tained." AYES, 37. Lawry Arnold Flatman Fowlds Massey Barclay Mckenzie, R. Gilfedder Bennet Buddo McNab Graham Meredith Carncross Hall-Jones Heke Millar Carroll Mills Colvin Herries Palmer Duncan Hogg Parata Hornsby Fisher
<page:1070>
Seddon Ward Hall Wilford Steward Stevens. Tanner Willis. NOES, 14. Allen, J. Lang Symes Collins Thomson, J. W. Monk Ell Tellers. O'Meara Fraser, A. L. D. Russell, G. W. Hutcheson, J. Smith, G. J. Pirani. Hardy Majority for, 23. Amendment negatived, and motion agreed to. TOUR OF THE DUKE AND DUCHESS OF CORNWALL AND YORK. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) .- Sir, I move, That the following address be presented to His Excellency the Governor for transmission to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, for sub- mission to His Majesty the King :- " We, the members of the House of Repre- sentatives of New Zealand in Parliament assembled, respectively beg to submit to your Majesty our congratulations on the safe return of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwell and York to England, and our thankfulness for the goodness of Almighty God for having mercifully watched over them, per- mitted their enjoymont of good health, and protected them from perils by land and sea." Sir, I think that will simply be giving expres- sion to the wishes of the people of the colony and of the members of the House. We are all delighted to know that their Royal Highnesses have arrived safely in the Motherland. We are all delighted that the visit has been paid to us, and, as expressed in this resolution,

we are delighted that after the perils of the ocean they should have arrived safely at the Mother- land, and should, during their visit, have enjoyed good health. Mr. G. J. SMITH (Christchurch City) .- I rise to a point of order. Our Standing Orders say distinctly that there shall be no business transacted after half-past five o'clock. Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- Motions of this sort are generally received with the indulgence of the House, even if it is a few minutes after the usual time for rising. I think members know that, at the end of the session, the Hon. the Speaker continues to sit sometimes up to six o'clock. It is with the general indulgence of the House that this is done, and I think that only one or two members are objecting. Captain RUSSELL .- I second the motion. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) .- I object to the fulsome terms of this motion. We have been nauseated with this sort of thing in the re- cess, when the House had no opportunity of putting into plain language what our feelings were, and I certainly object to the House being saddled, at this time of day, with language of that kind purporting to come from the members of this House. Just let me read it, and mem- bers will see :- " We, the members of the House of Represen- tatives of New Zealand in Parliament assembled, respectfully beg to submit to your Majesty our Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to England, and our thank- fulness for the goodness of Almighty God for having mercifully watched over them, permitted their enjoyment of good health, and protected them from perils by land and sea." Every honourable member knows that, so far as good health on a trip of this sort is con- cerned, it depends almost entirely upon himself. The fact that our recent visitors are in good health surely is sufficient without referring to it in terms of such toadyism as we have in this resolution. I think it would be sufficient to pass a resolution authorising the sending of a message expressing our pleasure at the safe arrival of the Royal visitors. I do not think those who receive messages of this sort are pleased with the greasy flattery contained in them. If we could get at what the feelings of members really are in regard to this resolution. the Premier, I am sure, would modify it. The terms of the resolution are not in any sense in accordance with the desires of members. I move, as an amendment, That all the words after " England " be struck out. Mr. HUTCHESON (Wellington City) .- The time has now arrived when every self-respecting man in this country should make a stand against this greasy toadyism. I beg to enter my strongest protest against the vulgar syco- phancy contained 'in the language of this mes- sage. I shall support the amendment to strike out all the words after " England." If it suits the Premier to indulge in this sort of thing, let him do so in his own name, and not in the name of the colony. Mr. TANNER (Avon) .- This is not a matter on which many words need be used or ought to be used. If the amendment is pressed to a division I shall vote for it. I think that any independent manly mind in this colony must revolt at the inflated and sycophantic language used in these addresses. It is not from any feeling of disloyalty that I speak in this way. because there is no man in New Zealand who is more loyal to his country and to his sovereign : but I do protest against it being represented that the people of New Zealand approve of such language as it is the custom to use in these addresses presented to the Governor. The sacred name of the Great Eternal is dragged into resolutions of this nature in such a way as to be nauseating in the extreme. I shall sup- port the amendment in the hope that future addresses may be no less loyal, but more truly dignified and respectful in their wording. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) .- I will ask that. whatever we do, let us be unanimous. I may say that the precedents in our Journals, on occasions of this kind, or a similar kind, have been followed. As we all know, the Address from the Throne contains an expression of thankfulness to Almighty God, and asks His assistance ; and our prayers in opening the daily proceedings in this Chamber also ask Divine guidance and blessings. I may point out that the resolution passed by the Legislative Coun- cil is similar to this, and, under the circum-
<page:1071>
not to press the amendment. The intention has been simply to follow what has been the rule in addresses of this kind. Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) .- There is no more loyal man in this colony than I-every one who knows anything of me knows that ; but I decline to lend my name to the sickening I shall vote stuff

contained in this resolution. for the amendment. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL (Riccarton) .- I do not wish to labour the point that has been made. In voting for the amendment, I do so not from any want of loyalty to His Majesty the King, or to our Empire, but I do so as a protest against the terms that are employed in the resolution. Also, I am not prepared to say that, in the eyes of the Almighty, whose name is used, any one person on this planet is dearer to Him than another. I read many years ago, " Are not the hairs of your head all numbered ? " That was not addressed to Royalty. I protest against language like that contained in this resolution being inserted in an address as from the Parliament of New Zealand. Mr. MEREDITH (Ashley) .- In view of the opinions expressed by members, I would suggest to the Premier that he should with- draw the resolution, recast it, and bring it down at half-past seven, and then a unanimous vote would be given in favour of it. Mr. SEDDON .- Probably we might do that at once. I would rather have a unanimous vote. I would suggest adopting these words : " In thankfulness to Almighty God for protect- ing them from perils by land and sea." An Hon. MEMBER .- Stick to the amendment. Mr. SEDDON .- I cannot strike out all refer- ence to " Almighty God." Mr. R. THOMPSON (Marsden) .- I would ask honourable members not to press this too far. We are making ourselves look very ridicu- lous. If this amendment is carried you might as well give up our public prayers altogether. I hope the House will not act hastily. Mr. HORNSBY (Wairarapa) .- I would not have risen to speak at all but for the remarks of the honourable member who has just sat down. No one in this House desires to do away with the invocation of the name of Almighty God in the opening of our proceed- ings. I intend to vote for the amendment, not because I object in any way to the use of the name of God in prayer, but because I believe the name of the Almighty ought not to be invoked unless it is done in a reverential and proper spirit. To commit ourselves to a state- ment, as it were, by resolution, that a special Providence had been watching over the Royal pair who visited this colony, is unbecoming to this House, and is not in accordance with a true spirit of reverence. Mr. COLLINS (Christchurch City) .- I take it that this discussion is rather intended as a protest against the nature of the telegrams and messages sent during the past year or two to England, which have been lengthy, wordy, and very seldom of a really dignified character. All we want to do now is to congratulate the Royal I express, if you like, our hope that they have returned in sound health, and that their journey has proved beneficial to themselves and to the Empire. I consider the earlier part of the address, which appears to meet with general approval, really embodies everything that is re- quired, and if anything at all should be added it might, as a way out of the present diffi- culty, be in the direction I have indicated. Mr. G. J. SMITH (Christchurch City) .- The Premier will understand now that he has brought this on himself by postponing other business in order to enable him to bring in this resolution after the usual hour for adjourn- ment. I am going to vote for the Premier's resolution because I think it is a right one, but I think it is about time the House asserted itself and claimed its right under the Standing Orders to arrange the business. Mr. SEDDON (Premier) .- It was understood that we should resume the order of business at half-past seven, and I wish to get this resolu- tion sent Home, as members will see by'cable that their Royal Highnesses have arrived at Portsmouth. The House divided on the question, " That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the resolution.' AYES, 27. Allen, E. G. Hall Seddon Hall-Jones Smith, G. J. Bennet Buddo Lawry Stevens McNab Steward Carncross Carroll Thompson, R. Mills Colvin Ward. O'Meara Palmer Duncan Tellers. Fowlds Parata Flatman Fraser, A. L. D. Russell, W. R. Hogg. Gilfedder NOES, 18. Russell, G. W. Herries Allen, J. Barclay Hornsby Thomson, J. W. Willis. Lang Collins Fisher Massey Tellers. Hutcheson, J. Meredith Graham Hardy Pirani Tanner. Heke Majority for, 9. Words retained, and resolution agreed to. # INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBI- TRATION BILL. On the question of the consideration 7.30. of the amendments made by the Legis- lative Council in this Bill, Mr. SEDDON (Minister of Labour) said, -- There will be disappointment somewhere in respect to the course which the Government take in regard to this matter. It has been alleged that the Government, and myself in particular, desire to set ourselves against the will of a majority of both Houses of Parlia- ment. I say

there has never been any ground for that statement-there has been nothing whatever to warrant it. I repeat now what I said on another occasion - namely, that I think the important departure in the policy
<page:1072>
Conciliation Boards in an indirect manner, is inconsistent with and contrary to the policy of this Parliament in respect to labour questions. When I say " indirectly " I mean that under clause 21 either party can now go past the Conciliation Board and go direct to the Arbitration Court. It means practically the reversal of what has hitherto been the policy of the country. This proposal was sprung as a surprise upon the House, and without the slightest warning, in the very early hours of the morning; but still there was a substantial majority, and what I naturally expected would happen was that the revisory Chamber would take this into consideration, and note that this was done without any expression at all from the people most interested-the employers and employed-and that this important departure, before it was allowed to pass into concrete form, would be reviewed by the revisory Chamber. But, Sir, it appears that there has been a com- plete reversal of opinion. Why, Sir, at the time of the passing of this legislation we found that the revisory Chamber would absolutely have nothing to do with the Arbitration Court, and would have nothing whatever to do with compulsory arbitration ; and now we stand in this position : the revisory Chamber has agreed to strike out and do away with conciliation. Well, Sir, time will tell. It is not for me to judge; it is not for me to attribute motives, or. to say anything disrespectful to those who have, by practically abolishing the Conciliation Boards, taken upon themselves a grave responsibility. But what has struck me right through in respect to the amend- ment made in the House, and what has gone on since, is this: I have asked myself this question, Is it a means to an end ? Is the desire to do away with Conciliation Boards and conciliation, and to force us to nothing else but the Arbitration Court, with a view to absolutely and ultimately repeal our labour legislation ? Time alone will solve that pro- blem ; but I do say, with every sense of respon- sibility, and with no desire to provoke debate or criticism, or to say that those who differ from me on this point are wrong, that the departure is of so serious a nature that I am compelled to say that it means causing friction as between the employers and employés of this colony. An Hon. MEMBER .- You are giving them a lead to think that. Mr. SEDDON .- It may be construed to be a lead, but I simply say I am of opinion that the result will be what every well-wisher of both the employers and employed desires to avoid. If a conflict is provoked, and this compulsory forcing of parties to the Arbitration Court is to be the means of provoking it, then I say the responsibility must go upon other shoulders, and not upon mine, nor upon those who are directly representing labour in this Parliament. That is the view I hold. I know, of course, that the only reason given for this important change has not been that the law has been defective, but that there have been short- Mr. Seddon our labour law. That is the only reason given, so far as I have heard, for this important departure. An Hon. MEMBER .- And it is sufficient too. Mr. SEDDON .- It is not sufficient, and it is not a good reason. I say you might just as well urge, in regard to the administration of our general laws, that any law was bad because in the administration of that law there were short- comings on the part of those who administered it. You cannot logically take up that position. That is really, so far as I can gather, the only tangible reason given for this important de- parture. However, there were two ways : one was to endeavour to have this question reviewed again in this Chamber; but as the Bill went from here with this amendment, and that amendment in clause 21 has not been inter- fered with in another place, as leader of the House, although it is contrary to my own convictions, and what I believe to be in the best interests of labour and of employers, I must observe what is due to a majority of the members of the House. As leader of the House, I have no right under these cir- cumstances to challenge the situation. Sir, this question came on at an early hour in the morning, and was really sprung as a sur- prise upon the House ; but I am convinced a majority of members think the proposal should have a trial. There were two courses to take : One was to bring on the trial now and to allow it to work till next session ; the other was to let the law remain and see between this and next

session what the result may be. There was only one of these two courses that was possible. There was a third course-& constitutional one - and that was, for the House to reconsider this point; but I do not think, in the face of the revising Chamber and with the majority there is there, that, even though the Bill had been recommitted in this Chamber for the purpose of striking out the word "both " and inserting "either party," there would be any hope of carrying it in an- other place. That would mean a deadlock, and there would be no Conciliation and Arbitration Act this session. The Government, therefore, with a due sense of the responsibility cast upon them, and, after having carefully weighed the situation, have concluded that they will see between this and next session what the result of giving either party the right to pass over the Conciliation Board may mean. We will see how many cases will be submitted to the Con- ciliation Boards. It may be, as Mr. Frostick has said in Canterbury, that the employers, for self-preservation, will not avail themselves of a law which a majority of members in this House and in another place have given to them, and will still consult the Conciliation Boards. It will be wise for them to do so. An Hon. MEMBER .- Why should they ? Mr. SEDDON. -- I hope they will. My own opinion is that it will be wise and well for them to do it, and I hope they may do it. Mr. G. J. SMITH .- They are going to. Mr. SEDDON .- I hope they will, and that

<page:1073>

will show there was no necessity for this amend- ment of the law. Hon. MEMBERS .- Oh, yes. Mr. SEDDON .- No. Honourable members are on the horns of a dilemma. If they do that, then why amend the law ? There is no answer to that. At all events, there are only a few months to go, and we will see what the working in the meantime may be. My own view of the matter is that, if you are not to have the moral support of the thousands of workers in the colony, neither the award of the Board nor that of the Court will have any effect. You must carry the thousands of workers with you, and if you defy them they will appeal to the right of all Britishers and let you know what you may expect. Honourable members may laugh, but they will laugh on the other side if they go too far. It is not wise to go too far. Now, I wish to say I have been from the start a strong supporter and promoter of this labour legislation. The world's favourable attention has been drawn to our labour legislation, and, as between employer and employed, the posi- tion in our colony to-day is superior to any- thing else within the Empire, or in any other country. If you disturb that condition of things it is, to my mind, a serious departure. How- ever, the departure will be made, in so far as section 21 is concerned ; but I believe the result will be that, although the machinery is here for the employers to ignore the Conciliation Board, they will not, in their own interests, ignore that tribunal. They will see it is the part of the machinery that clears the way. If there is no- thing but the Court to go to the cost will be considerable. In the past the Conciliation Boards have kept down the cost very much, be- cause they have settled many of the points and left only a few to be determined by the Courts. An Hon. MEMBER .- Why say the Act is being run to death ? Mr. SEDDON. - Sir, drowning men will grasp at a straw, and there are men who hate this legislation, and if they had the chance to kill it-not in a manly and straightforward way, but in an indirect way, and in a way that would not bring them face to face with public opinion -they would kill it. There is another im- portant departure in the Bill: I allude to the amendments made on the motion of the mem- ber for Palmerston. There, again, I say we were not treated fairly in respect to the matter. " Why so ?" members will ask. It was in this way : that in agreeing to the proposal-namely, that either party should nominate a Board of experts-I thought that when that was carried there would be no attempt made to go the length that was gone by the member for Wanganui. I may say I believe that in some cases, where absolutely expert know- ledge is required, there may be an advantage in the proposal. The other amendments made in the Bill are minor amendments. The two important amendments made are: (1) That either party can call in experts to act and form the Conciliation Board, and (2) that under sec- tion 21 either party to a dispute can ignore the Conciliation Board and go direct to the Arbitra- VOL. CXIX .- 67. 1 tion Court. In respect to the first amendment, I think a great

concession was made, and after that amendment had been agreed to I did not think we would have been pressed to the extreme course contained in the motion of the member for Wanganui. That honourable gentle- man has stated that I was aware of that particular amendment. I never sawit. It was drafted by the member for Grey, and added to by the honourable member himself. After that was drafted I never saw it at all. The honour- able member did come to me with an amend- ment, and when I looked at it I laughed. Mr. WILLIS .- You did not laugh after- wards. Mr. SEDDON .- I laughed at the one you showed me, and I said it had not the slightest chance of being carried. It was preposterous ; and the honourable member knows as well as I do that when it was shown to other members of the House they told him the same thing. Mr. WILLIS .- No, they did not. Mr. SEDDON. - Well, I have my own opinion, and I say that every member of the House who reads it will come to the same con- clusion. What I object to is that the honour- able gentleman should have the temerity to state that he showed me the amendment he proposed to move as in clause 21 of the Bill two hours before it was proposed. I challenge him to say I ever saw it. He admitted he had never seen it himself till it was handed to him by the honourable member for the Grey. I say the honourable member had the idea to remit the question to either party to go to the Court. I like to be fair, and I say that is the view he held ; but the amendment he showed me was such that I feel I made a mistake in not accept- ing it. I should have accepted it. It was such a piece of nonsense that if it had gone into the Bill it would have done no harm at all. It would have been absolutely inoperative; but it was converted into something tangible by the honourable member for the Grey. The honour- able member for Wanganui had another amend- ment which he submitted, and we know how that was treated. It was never considered seriously, but was rejected. That is a state- ment of the situation. Well, Sir, I am not speaking with any hope of changing members' opinions upon this point. I have accepted what is the will of a large majority of the House on this question, although my opinion differs there- from. There has been no question of party introduced into the matter at all. There are labour members of the House who are more particularly affected by this matter, and I may say that I obtained their views. After discus- sion with them, the conclusion arrived at was that to set up a stonewall would be futile, and, there being no hope of changing the situation; the best thing to do was to let the matter go for the present and see how it worked, and then to bring it up first thing next session if we found it was not working in the best interests of labour and in the best interests of the employers of the colony. There were two courses for us to take-one the course adopted, the other to disagree with the amend-

<page:1074>

wall, and lose the Bill altogether; but I do not think, nor do the Government think, that to take up a position of that kind would be either dignified or consistent with consti- tutional usage. That being the case, whilst accepting the situation under protest, I move now that the amendments made in the Bill be agreed to. It is my duty to point out to the House the amendments made by the Legis- lative Council, and the nature of those amendments. In their nature they are not such as to materially affect the measure itself. If members will look at the Bill they will find the first amendment in section 11. There the words " made prior" are struck out and the words "in force " are inserted. The effect is the same, though the reading is slightly different. Now, the words " made prior " would carry it back to every award since the Concilia- tion and Arbitration Act has been in force. All that was intended was that the awards now in force should be affected; consequently, the amendment is an improvement of the Bill, and I must ask the House, therefore, to agree to that. Then, we come to clause 12: there, evidently, it was the intention of the House to give the trade-unions the position of being affected by any award made. The difference between the amendments made in the Bill as sent up by this House is that we did not give the power to the trade-unions to initiate. In another place they have given that power of initiation, as I read the Bill; that is the alteration that has been made. As the Bill left the House, whilst trade- unions would be bound by an award, they had no power of initiation ; and I will tell you more now, because I do not want, in a matter of

such moment as this, to trifle with it. It is too serious to trifle with. The trade- unions now will have the power of initiation as well as being subject to the awards ; formerly it was only the industrial unions that had the power of initiation. There are some members, of course, who question my statement, but I know why the amendments were made, I know the objects they had in view, and the effects of the amendments made. An Hon. MEMBER .- Where does the power of initiation come in ? Mr. SEDDON .- In the interpretation. I can only say in respect to that amendment that I ask the House to agree to it. Sir, as regards section 15, there are references to certain sec- tions of the original Act which are struck out, and I do not think myself that the amendments made in clause 12 are necessary. Section 19 was struck out by the Council : "Proceedings for the enforcement of an industrial award or order of the Court may be taken by the Inspector of Factories for the district." Formerly, we passed a clause which said, " That the Inspector for a district should take proceedings for the enforcement of awards." We said it should be compulsory. The other place has said it may be. Well, there is just this in it : the party who take proceedings to compel respect for an award Mr. Seddon cause they take that action; and we thought it was fair that the responsibility should be thrown upon some person who would not be thrown out of employment because he took action to compel respect for an award. An- other place has struck out the word " shall" and inserted "may." Well, I tell the House and country that in every place instructions will be given to Inspectors under the Govern- ment to take action to compel respect for the awards of the Court. The Legislative Council may put in the word "may," but so long as the present Government have the administra- tion of this Act the word "may" is the word "shall," so far as that is concerned. Section 19 is a new clause which, it 8.0. has been said, has the effect of the original clause. It has been contended that it is worded better, and that it will have the same effect. I am not so sure of that myself. At all events, I know this : that if I were to move to disagree with the amendments with the view of holding a Conference, I and those who sup- port the Government would be accused of en- deavouring to thwart the majority having effect given to their wishes in respect to this Bill. That being the case, I do not wish the House to be placed in a false position. I say we are now passing a measure which, to my mind. is a serious departure of policy, and, I fear. in- imical to both employer and employed. I say it is questionable what the result of that will be, and it is altogether contrary to what was done when we passed the original Con- ciliation and Arbitration Act. And I conclude my remarks by saying that I do earnestly impress upon members - and I will impress upon those to whom this legislation specially applies-that they should respect the law as originally passed, and not lightly set aside the Conciliation Boards, but that they should use that machinery with a view to coming to a happy solution of the difficulties that arise between employer and employed. If they do that all will be well ; but if they take advantage of what is here passed by the Legislature, and on every occasion ignore the Conciliation Boards, then I say-and my words will prove prophetic-it means trouble to the employed and to the employers. We started with con- ciliation, and I say we ought to keep strictly to conciliation. Conciliation means the moral support of the people and the moral support of those who are bound by these awards : and. that being the case, to take away conciliation. as by the amendments has been done, is to my mind, objectionable and will prove a grave and serious mistake. Mr. G. J. SMITH (Christchurch City) .- I want, first of all, to enter my emphatic protes: against the speech which we have just heard. In one part of the Premier's speech he said-I presume he was referring to members of this House-that they were trying by subterfuge to kill the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. and he said that they were not willing to come out into the open and say so. I say, if the Premier has that opinion of any member of this House

<page:1075>

given him an opportunity to repel the charge. So far as I am aware, the employers of this colony do not want the Conciliation and Arbi- tration Act repealed. They recognise this : that while there may have been mistakes in the administration, and advantage taken of some of the provisions of the Act, yet, as a

method of settling disputes, it is infinitely better than the old method of strikes. I say again that, while industrial matters have been in a state of ferment for some time past, they are beginning to settle down, owing to the fact that awards have been made extending over the next two years ; but the speech of the Premier to-night is calculated to again stir up industrial strife between em- ployers and employed, and was delivered, I suppose, for electioneering purposes during the next campaign. Again, the Premier referred to the fact that if the administration of any law of the colony by our Courts of justice was not satisfactory, that we would not repeal the law. I say that if the Courts of justice administered any law in the way the Conciliation Act is being administered by the Boards, there would have to be some amendment proposed by the Govern- ment. To ask the House to agree to the amend- ments made by another place in the way the Premier has done to-night is simply to incite the labour organizations of the colony to rise against the amendments put into the Act before they have had a fair trial, and to endeavour to have them altered during the next session of Parliament. It is pretty well understood in the House that the speech we have just listened to has been deliberately made with the object of stirring up debate and enabling the Hon. the Premier to attend a public func- tion during the continuance of the debate. And yet his speech will be telegraphed through- out the colony, casting a slur on the employers, and casting aspersions on members of this House, and all for what? I say that the Premier's statement that we are trying to do away with Conciliation Boards in an indirect manner is contrary to fact. What is the position in re- gard to these Boards? I am willing to admit that the Dunedin Board has done very good work. That Board from its inception has had the advantage of capable business-men being members of it, remarkably good representa- tives from both the workers and the employers. The consequence is that that Board has done good work. But where shall we find the next good Board? The Wellington Board? I ven- ture to say that the Wellington Board has done more to undermine the principle of the Conciliation Act than any one else in the colony. I confess that I did expect that there would have been a debate as to whether these amendments would be agreed to or not. The Premier himself created that impression by stating that another opportunity would be given for considering this measure before the amend- ments were hnally passed, and it was freely rumoured that he was going to oppose these amendments. I am delighted to find that the honourable gentleman has recognised that a majority of this House and the majority in to say that, if the course the Premier has taken to-night had not been followed, there would have been a considerable amount of trouble before him before the end of the session. With respect to the amendments, the Premier says we are trying to undermine and do away with the Act. I say that is incorrect. The Boards, speaking generally, have not the confidence of the people of the colony at the present time. What are the amendments we have made ? We have not done away with the Boards. The whole tone of the Premier's. speech was to the effect that we had taken conciliation out of the Act. I say we have conciliation in the Act in a more perfect form. We have left in the present Conciliation Board, and, in addition, we have put in special Boards of Conciliation. We have also given the right to go direct to the Court. What does that mean ? It means that if an industrial dispute arises we have given the disputants a chance of having the dispute promptly settled ; and is it not in the interests of trade, and of the employés as well as of the employers, that a trade dispute shall be settled at the earliest possible moment, and with as little friction as possible ? Then, many of the disputes are on technical matters that an ordinary Board would have very little know- ledge of. In that case, we have said that either party can apply for a special Board, and a special Board is set up. Is that taking away conciliation ? I say it is conciliation in a better form. The evidence that will be taken by the special Board, if the case goes to the Arbitration Court, will be of special service to the Judge of that Court and the gentlemen associated with him. I want emphatically to say that, so far as these amendments are concerned, I believe they will conduce to the better working of the Act. The Premier, in the course of his remarks, said -- it was almost in the nature of a threat- that the employers of this colony had better take care, and other remarks of that nature. I think

the honourable gentleman would have been wise had he waited until the employers of the colony had shown a disposition to ignore the conciliation sections of the Act before he indulged in threats. From what I have seen of the Arbitration Court and its working, I ven- ture to say that if any section of the employers of this colony virtually ignore the conciliation clauses of the Act, and go to the Court without attempting to come to an amicable arrange- ment, Mr. Justice Cooper will have some very strong remarks to make. The amendments made in this Bill in another place have, I think, in many respects improved the Bill. The Premier has already indicated one or two of them, and I want also to refer to section 16 for a minute or two. The amendment made by the Council in reference to the enforcement of awards is that they have struck out the word "shall " and inserted the word "may." I do not know what induced them to make that alteration, except to give the Inspectors some discretion. I venture to say the employers of the colony are quite willing that the awards

<page:1076>

may be a genuine difference of opinion as to the interpretation to be placed upon certain clauses of an award, but, as soon as an inter- pretation is got from the Court, I believe the employers will readily abide by the award, and loyally endeavour to carry it out. The reason for the alteration made may be this : that if there is an alleged breach of the award the Inspector of Factories may look into the matter and come to the conclusion that he could not secure conviction ; in that case it is evidently better not to institute proceedings than to institute proceedings and not secure a con- viction ; and, by inserting the word "may," the Inspector is given the right-I presume, after reference to the head of the department- to determine whether he should take proceed- ings or not. I do not believe there was any ulterior object in altering the word. The alteration of section 21 is, I think, another good alteration. The right honourable gentle- man did not refer to the alteration made to the clause in the other place. The posi- tion now is that if a dispute is desired to go direct to the Court of Arbitration, either party must, previous to the hearing of the dis- pute by the Board, give notice that they so desire it to go straight to the Court. That is only fair, because, if they thought there was no chance of coming to an arrangement, the notice should be given before the Board entered upon the hearing of the case. I had not intended to have said anything in connection with the Bill, because I recognise that after the Bill had been passed by this House, and sent to another place, and had come back in what I think is a slightly amended form, it is for us to agree to it and get it placed on the statute-book ; and if the Premier had confined his remarks to mov- ing that the amendments be agreed to, it would have been much better. The early part of his speech was an attack on the employers of this colony, and an attempt to incite trouble in the industrial world. Sir, from the high and honourable position he occupies, and from the responsible position he occupies, he ought to have weighed his words very much more carefully than he appears to have done- because I venture to say that unless we can get industrial peace in the colony there will be a serious outlook for us. The honourable gentle- man, instead of attempting to stir up strife, ought, on the other hand, to do his best to make the relations between employers and employed of the most amicable character ; but his speech to-night was of the reverse character, and more likely to create friction and trouble than to allay it. I hope the working of the Act during the next twelve months will prove that the amend- ments that have been made have improved the Act, and tended to the more amicable working of the industries of the colony. Mr. WILLIS (Wanganui) .- When a battle has been fought and won, Sir, it is neither wise nor generous on the part of the victor to be too particular as to the language used by the one who has been defeated. The Premier has made use of intemperate language, no doubt from Mr. G. J. Smith acknowledge that he has made a good fight for what he believes to be in the cause of concilia- tion and arbitration. I, at any rate, will do him the justice to say that ; but he must re- member that a large number of members of both Houses of the Legislature are equally com- petent to judge as to whether the present system is working well or whether a better system can be instituted. I regret that the Premier has made use of statements that are not correct. He says, in

the first place, that the position is going to be reversed. Sir, there will be no re- versal whatever. It has been, I think, the uni- versally expressed opinion of the people of this colony that we should have conciliation and arbitration. But the system has been working so badly that the time had come when a change should be made. We must, of course, make allowances for a little heat on the part of the Premier, but when he makes a statement that a large number of employers are doing their best to destroy the system, I think he can hardly believe such a statement himself, be- cause he must know it is contrary to fact. The employers generally have shown no hostility to the system. They have been quite agree- able to have these disputes placed before the Boards or Courts in a fair manner, and that in all cases the awards should be carried out without murmuring. But when we come to the awards of the Conciliation Board of Wel- lington, and when we find that the proceedings have been prolonged for days and weeks, and when we know that men composing these Boards are appointed at a fixed rate per day, and that the longer these disputes last the better it is for them, and the longer will they receive their pay, on reflection it must be admitted that the system is not altogether as good as it should be. Now, what is proposed under the amended system! At present the Conciliation Board - per- haps composed of butchers or bakers - has to try disputes relative to totally different trades, and I think it must be admitted that their opportunity would not be as good as where the different trades settle the disputes among themselves. The intention of the clause in regard to conciliation was, that before going there an opportunity might be afforded to the employers and employés to settle their own dis- putes-that we should have a Board of Conci- liation appointed from either side, with an inde- pendent chairman, and let the case be fairly tried. If either party was not satisfied then, there is always the Arbitration Court open ; and why should we be afraid of the Arbitration Court? Their judgments have been just, and, I believe. throughout the colony there has been a feeling of satisfaction-that in all cases their findings have been considered fair and aboveboard. Sir, the Premier stated, with regard to my first clause, that when I submitted it to him he laughed at it as an absurd clause. Well, Sir, a great deal of thought had been bestowed on that clause by those who had some knowledge of the matter. I do not speak of myself, because the clause was
<page:1077>
legal profession, who is more competent to draft a clause than the Premier himself. What was proposed in that clause was in effect very much the same as at present, except that power was given to the Governor in Council to draw up regulations to give effect to the intention of the clause. Well, Sir, I submitted that to the Premier, and he simply laughed at it, and said it was absurd to try to get it passed. I .said then that I knew the feeling of the House was with me, and that he would find it would be carried. The clause came on in due course, and the Premier took exception then to the Government being introduced by means of the "Governor in Council, and after some little dis- cussion it was agreed it would be a good thing not to introduce the Governor in Council in it. Then, the honourable member for Palmerston proposed another clause, which in effect was the same as mine, but got at the object in a very much simpler manner. It was agreed then that, if I would withdraw my clause, that of the member for Palmerston should be taken in its place. The Premier was quite right when he stated I did not show him the clause relating to arbitration, and I am willing to make ac- knowledgment when there is anything just or right in the objection. I did not show the Premier my clause in regard to the question of arbitration, and the reason was simply that the clause was not then drafted. Mr. SEDDON .- You stated in Committee that you showed it to me. Mr. WILLIS .- I did not. It was not shown at the time, because it was not drafted, but, at the same time, the Premier must acknowledge that he received fair warning that a change was going to be made when I gave him notice, at the ten-o'clock adjournment, of the clause that had been drafted. Well, Sir. so far as the colony is concerned, I think it will consider it is perfectly safe in regard to these alterations. The Premier need not be alarmed. He seems to look upon employers of labour as his natural ·enemies, and that he has got to rely solely on the workers of this colony. Well, Sir, if the workers of the

colony are his friends he should endeavour, by all means in his power, to contrive legislation that will bring employer and em- ployé into line, and enable them to work amicably together, so that the advance in trades and manufactures may be for the joint benefit of both parties. The Premier should consider that. When he made the statement he did in regard to employers, that they were trying to destroy arbitration and conciliation, I can only think that he spoke with heat, and that he did not mean, and could not have meant, what he said, because there has been nothing whatever to justify it. I think, also, that when he spoke about these employers he should have spoken out straight, and should have said who these employers are who he stated have done their best to destroy con- ciliation and arbitration. I do not know whether he was pointing to myself as one of them, but I say that during the time I have been in this House I have been a supporter of labour legislation. There may have been in lated to do a great deal of harm in this country, and which the Premier was never able to pass. I was always an opponent of these Bills, and, I am glad to say, a very suc- cessful opponent. But what I wish particu- larly to state is this: that I am a warm advo- cate of arbitration and conciliation. I think it is one of the best things ever introduced into this country. But do not let it be one-sided. Do not put employers in such a position that they are obliged to take disputes before Con- ciliation Boards such as the Wellington one, as at present constituted. Let them have an opportunity, in the first place, of settling their own disputes. That is the main thing; and I believe, myself, so far from the Premier having cause to be alarmed as to the future of this amended Act-and I consider that I am quite as capable of judging of the effect of it as he is-the Premier will find there will be satisfaction throughout the colony, and a general feeling that we shall get some rest from the eternal irritation that has been going on for the last two or three years. Sir, I do not want to go over the ground traversed by the honourable member for Christ- church City. I consider he has put the ques- tion in a remarkably clear and lucid manner, and it is no use to repeat what has already been said to the House, but I can only say, in con- cluding my speech, do not let us try to raise up bad feeling between employers and em- ployes. We want to work together, and we want to have a feeling of unity so that we may pull together, and I think, myself, we ought to endeavour to do all in our power to promote a universal feeling of good-will between employers and employes from this time out. I am pleased now that the Premier has ad- mitted the position that, where both Houses by such large majorities have adopted the course they have, as the Premier of this colony and leader of the House, he has to bow to that decision, and, although he may not agree with what has been done, still he is quite willing that the amended Act shall come into force. Mr. SEDDON (Premier). - I wish 8.30. to make a personal explanation. I do not wish to be placed in a false position in respect to anything I have said. The honour- able member was incorrect when he said I had made statements that were absolutely incorrect. To show that I was correct I may say that I had fortified myself with the amendment the honourable member showed me, and it is as follows :- "The provisions of sections thirty-six to thirty-eight, and forty to fifty-one, of the principal Act are hereby repealed, and the following enacted in lieu thereof :- "(1.) The members to be elected under section thirty-five of the principal Act shall have jurisdiction to try such industrial disputes as may be referred to them by the Governor. " (2.) The Governor may make regula- tions providing, on the filing of the dispute, for the election of the mem- bers of the Board, such members to

<page:1078>

and of workers affected by the indus- trial dispute." These sections are all the sections of the prin- cipal Act referring to the Conciliation Board - the election of the Board, vacancies to be filled, appointment of Chairman, quorum of Board, absence of Chairman, and acts of Board. All the clauses referring to the Conciliation Boards under the original Act the honourable gentle- man moved to repeal ; and when I said an at- tempt had been made to do away with Conci- liation Boards I said that which is correct. It is here in black and white in the honourable The honourable gentleman's amendments. gentleman also said that the members to be elected under section 35 of the principal Act should have jurisdiction to try industrial

dis- putes that might be referred to them by the Governor. Now, section 35 says,- " The Board of each industrial district shall consist of such unequal number of persons as the Governor determines, being not more than five." He repeals every clause in the Act as far as Conciliation Boards are concerned, and he says the members to be elected under section 35 should have jurisdiction to try industrial dis- putes that might be referred to them by the Governor. Therefore my statement was ab- solutely correct. The honourable gentleman did away with the Boards, and said that all dis- putes were to be dealt with by the Court, but they were to be referred to the Court by the Governor. In subsection (2) the honourable member proposed, --- "The Governor may make regulations pro- viding, on the filing of the dispute, for the election of the members of the Board, such members to be elected by the unions of em- ployers and of workers affected by the industrial dispute." There is his own amendment: it is in pos- session of the House. An Hon. MEMBER .- How many voted for it ? Mr. SEDDON .- It does not matter how many voted for it. The point is that the honourable member tried to do away with the Boards, and, when he could not do so, he wished to give the option to either party to go to the Court. I say, then, that anything I stated was correct. An attempt was made to do away with the Boards. I looked on the amendment to give to either party the right to go to the Court with suspicion. Now, anything I said was not said with heat ; and, as far as the employers are concerned, I did not want to say a single word against them. I desired that employers and employed should work together for the common good, and if a warning was given by me it was not by way of a threat. I ask employers, not- withstanding the power that is being given to them, to utilise the Conciliation Boards. Mr. WILLIS .- Sir, I wish to make a personal explanation. The honourable gentleman is in- correct in saying that I endeavoured to do away with Conciliation Boards, because my clause was moved with the intention of setting up Boards of Conciliators composed of the em- ployers and the employed. If the Premier Mr. Seddon drafted he is welcome to do so ; but he has no right to say that it was my intention to do any- thing that was not fair between employers and employed by means of conciliation. Directly the member for Palmerston showed me what he proposed to introduce I gave way, and said his amendment was a better one than mine, and that I would be pleased to see his amendment take the place of the one I had brought down. That shows clearly there was no intention on my part to do away with the Conciliation Boards. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) .- Sir, I regret that the Premier, under the guise of a personal expla- nation, has attempted to be unfair not only to the member for Wanganui, but to those who sup- ported that honourable member in the action he was taking in regard to this amendment. The Premier says the intention of the amendment was to do away with the Conciliation Boards. There is nothing in the words of the amendment to repeal section 35 of the main Act. What is section 35 of the main Act ?- "The Board of each industrial district shall consist of such unequal number of persons as the Governor determines, being not more than five, of whom- "(1.) One (being the Chairman) shall be elected by the other members in manner hereinafter provided ; and " (2.) The other members shall, in manner hereinafter provided, be elected by the respective industrial unions of em- ployers and of workers in the indus- trial district, such unions voting separately and electing an equal num- ber of such members : "Provided that an industrial union shall not be entitled to vote unless its registered office has been recorded as aforesaid for at least three months next preceding the date fixed for the election." That is not repealed, and that is the main pro- vision for the constitution of Conciliation Boards. But what has been repealed, or would have been if the first amendment of the mem- ber for Wanganui had been carried, was the procedure in electing those members ; and, pro- bably rather foolishly, the amendment pro- posed to place in the power of the Government the right to prescribe what the procedure should be. That is the only difference ; and I maintain this: that the amendment as proposed by me, and accepted by the Premier, goes very much further in the direction that is indicated by the member for Wanganui than his own amendment, and I was surprised when the Premier objected to the amendment of the member for Wanganui and accepted my amend- ment. I am very glad indeed that the Pre- mier has, on second

thoughts, decided to accept the verdict of both Houses of Parliament. Just now he expressed his disappointment that in this matter the Legislative Council had not acted as the revisory Chamber-the Premier's opinion of a revisory Chamber being one with which he does as he pleases, irrespective of whether he is right or wrong. It has been an unfortunate thing in the past that the other
<page:1079>
what has been done in the legislative Chamber, and at the instance of the Minister, and, in many cases, much to the after disappointment of the Government. I only need refer to the Horo- whenua Block Act, where amendments proposed in the measure and refused by the Government were accepted in the other Chamber on the motion of the Government, which practically destroyed the original intention of the Act; and I could give other instances where the will of the representatives of the people has been balked by the Government through the medium of the other Chamber. Now, with regard to this question itself, there is no doubt about it that the feeling is very strong against the man- ner in which one, at least, of the Conciliation Boards has been worked. And that feeling has been voiced by the Premier himself. Why, who is the author of the term that the Conciliation Boards were " riding the Act to death "? The Premier is the author of that term ; and I say that in some respects he is right. A return which has been laid before the other Chamber proves that very conclusively in regard to one Board, through whose action these amendments in the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act have been effected. Here we have the return of the cost of administration during the last year of the six Boards of the colony : Auckland District, £366 3s. ; Westland, £17 6s. ; Canter- bury, £109 4s .; Otago, £220 14s. 2d. ; Tara- naki, £8 8s. ; and Wellington, £1,089 16s. 5d. The whole of the the rest of the colony cost a little under £800, while Wellington swal- lowed up nearly £1,100. Now, there is the strongest argument against retaining all, the Conciliation Boards as they exist at present, especially when we look at the result of the expenditure of the £1,100 in Wellington. Two cases settled by the Board at a cost of £1,100 ! There was also one partly settled by the Board, one modification agreed to, and one withdrawn on the recommendation of the Board. Now, can any sane man say that the expenditure was justified with regard to the Wellington Board ? I say, if there is any part of the colony which is to blame for the alteration in the policy of conciliation it is Wellington, on account of what has been going on here for the last two years. I maintain that the very clause the Premier objects to so very strongly is not any alteration of the principle of the present Act at all-that the clause in- serted on the motion of the honourable mem- ber for Wanganui-clause 21-makes no altera- tion in the present law except this : that it saves the expense of the Conciliation Board. At the present time, if the employers do not wish their case to be finally decided by the Conciliation Board, they have simply to ignore the pro- ceedings of the Board and go to the Arbitra- tion Court. But under the amendment pro- posed by the honourable member for Wanganui the expense of one party taking the case before a Conciliation Board when the other is deter- mined to go to arbitration, no matter what is the result of the preliminary inquiry, is done away with, and the dispute is taken in the first instance to and settled by the Arbitration Court i he has paid to his employes, that then the boot, be done under some Conciliation Boards. It - is fortunate for us, for the policy of concilia- tion, that all the Boards are not like the Wellington Board. I notice with regard to the Dunedin Board that every endeavour there is made to conciliate before arbitration is brought in. In Dunedin the course taken by the Board before it commences to investigate a dispute is to ask the parties to the dispute to meet to- gether and see what agreement they can come to with regard to any portion of the claim. By doing that the ground is cleared very often of a very large portion of the dispute, and the work of the Conciliation Board is whittled down considerably. If any attempt of that sort had been made in Wellington we could not possibly have had the expenses piled up in the way they have been piled up by the Conciliation Board. An Hon. MEMBER .- And the expenses to the employers. Mr. PIRANI .- Of course, no consideration seems to be given by the Premier to the indi- vidual cost to the employer and the employés of these proceedings. One employer in Wel- lington told me

some time ago that he had given up attending to his business, and was spending all his spare time at the Conciliation Board endeavouring todefend the cases brought against him. I believe that this is the case with a number of employers. Now, I say that the employers are just as anxious to conciliate as are the employés if they could get a tribunal that had their confidence; and if that tri- bunal is appointed, and is worked in a proper manner, it will be found as the re- sult of the amendments made to this Act -it is my sincere belief it will be found that a great many cases will be settled finally by special Conciliation Boards. In certain disputes expert Boards will be ap- pointed, and they will deal in an expert way with the disputes brought before them. It is all very well to argue that the probability is that if employés go on certain Boards and give decisions against the employers they will be liable to lose their positions; but we know that in almost every occupation in the colony you will find experts who are not employés in the trade, who have retired from the trade, and who by their large experience are much more suitable to decide disputes than those who are parties to the disputes. And I feel certain that in those cases they will be called in to settle dis- putes. The Premier has not only criticized the action of those members who were responsible for the alteration in this legislation in the House, but he has spared no opportunity out- side the House to denounce what has been done by them. We have only to go to what took place at the gathering on Labour Day to show how anxious the Premier is to pose as the only friend of the working-man-how anxious he is to point out, even when the members concerned are his own supporters, what enemies to labour they are in the House. I think, if the men the Premier is pointing at had their actions as em- ployers placed side by side with those of the Premier as an employer in regard to the wages
<page:1080>
never been noted personally as a very liberal employer. You have only to take the case of the Private Secretaries who are engaged by the Premier, and take their hours of work, the work that is put upon them, the conditions under which their labour is carried out, and I guarantee that no other employés in the colony work where the conditions are so hard and where so little consideration is paid to the men, to their comfort, to their lives almost, as is paid by the Premier to those men who are im- mediately in his employ. It is very amusing to think that the Premier should pose in this House or outside of it as an employer of labour, and endeavour to cast ridicule and throw blame upon other members who are endeavour- ing to do their best in this question according to their lights. I trust that the amendments in this Bill will be found to work satisfactorily, and I feel sure that if they do not, then if any better proposals can be brought down this ses- sion the House is so anxious to see this Act work smoothly and well that there will be no difficulty in placing them upon the statute-book. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL (Riccarton) .- It is a somewhat extraordinary position that, after this important measure has passed through both Houses of the Legislature, we should have had a discussion of the kind which has been initiated by the Premier. I should not have risen this evening, after the statement the Premier made that the Government propose to accept the policy of the Bill as it has returned to this House from the Council, which should be considered as closing that phase of the question, but for the somewhat extraordinary defence of the Conciliation Board, and the attack of the Premier upon the employers. There can be no doubt that within the last two or three months a very strong feeling has grown up throughout the colony against the Boards, or perhaps I should say against one of them. The member for Palmerston, in the statement he has made regarding the expenses of the different Boards, has given the cue to what is the position. He has stated that the Wellington Board, which naturally does its business under the very eyes of the Premier, has cost in twelve months more than the whole of the rest of the Boards in the colony. Why should there be this enormous increase in the expense in Wellington in the working of the Conciliation Board as compared with other centres? Members who come from Canterbury District know that the workers there have, in a legitimate manner, used the Board and the Court for the purpose of bettering their position. I believe that in the Province of Canterbury there are more unions and more disputes than in Welling- ton, and that there is a very active labour feeling. I

repeat my question, Why in Wellington City has the Board of Conciliation cost more than the whole of the other Boards in New Zealand ? The reason can only be that in this city the Board has been used by certain persons connected with it for their own pur- poses, and that they have used it as a Mr. Pirani weeks ago a fire took place in a building on Lambton Quay in which the Conciliation Board held its meetings. The spectacle was described in one of the Wellington papers of three members of the Conciliation Board meeting on the doorstep of the burning build- ing and declaring that the case set down for that day was adjourned ; and they, of course, claimed their fee for that attendance. The Premier is a man whose eyes are wide open, and he has seen this kind of thing going on under his very nose. He has done more-he has spoken about it; and I say, if there is any one man in the colony who has done more than another to fan a spirit of discontent with the Boards it is the Premier. The Premier has made speeches which have created a feeling of dissatisfaction in this House, which was inter- preted by the member for Wanganui and the member for Palmerston in their objections : and the blow that was struck at the Boards in the Bill was the result of the spirit of indignation and contempt that had been created by the Premier. On the 31st July the Premier said,- "He thought that in respect to the Concilia- tion Board's proceedings there was room for improvement. In his opinion, so many cases and so many persons being cited meant riding the thing to death. He thought there ought to be more Court, less Board, and more con- ciliation." That quotation appeared in Hansard of the 31st July, 1901, page 89. A few days after that the Premier was waited on by a deputation of persons connected with some Wellington unions. At that interview he spoke his mind freely. He said,- "The Premier replied that it was with some diffidence he had to express the opinion that the way things were going, with so much work thrown on the Boards and the Court, there would ultimately be a breakdown. He went on to say that the other day he spoke very strongly on this matter "-here, of course, he was re- ferring to his statement in the House, which I have quoted-"and he had very good reasons for doing so, for that morning he had received a telegram stating that four hundred employers had been cited to appear in one dispute at Auckland. It seemed to him there was no necessity for that, and that it was riding the thing to death." Here, again, he uses the phrase, "riding the thing to death." But to proceed :- "Every employer was bound by an award, whether he was cited or not, and employers were not so stupid as not to know what was going on. A great deal of time was also wasted in duplicating evidence. In time both men and employers would get sick of it ; that was what was going to happen." But the right honourable gentleman went further. He said,- "It was more important to have industrial disputes settled, and get something like a rest. Employers did not want to be everlastingly in a turmoil, and what the country wanted was to have the awards made to go on working. As to

<page:1081>

Act caused an increase in the number of cases, but it was about time some of them were cleared off. It appeared to him that the hear- ing cf disputes lasted too long, owing to the duplication of evidence and too many em- ployers being cited. Some one had to stop what was going on. He had no hesitation in saying that they did not want everlasting in- dustrial war, and, that being so, he wanted, as far as possible, to bring about peace." The final quotation I make from this speech of the Premier to the Wellington unionists is as follows : - "The law was a good law, but of late it had been brought into disrepute, and great care must be taken or they would have a revulsion of public opinion." That revulsion has taken place, and it was created by the speeches of the Premier, who, in the pointed terms which I have just quoted, described the incapacity, selfishness, sordidness, and greed of the Wellington Board, which he evidently had in his mind 9.0. all through the discussion with that deputation. Then, after setting this flame going, and fanning discontent in the coun- try, can any one understand how the right honourable gentleman can in this House make the speech he did in favour of the Boards of Conciliation ? It is merely another instance of what we all know. After the Premier has taken a stand there are various

deputations up the backstairs. The omnipotent labour party of Wellington approach him and tell him what dreadful things are going to happen unless he moderates his tone, and the result is he comes to the House and delivers a speech on the lines he has used to-night. Now, with re- gard to the general amendment that has been made, I think the position has been clearly stated by the honourable member for Palmers- ton. As he said, neither the employers nor the workers are now compelled to go before the Board of Conciliation. All they have to do is to stay away, and an ex parte award is then made in the ordinary course by the Board of Conciliation. When they appear before the Court the whole dispute is gone into thoroughly. That being the case, what possible harm can there be in the amendment moved by the member for Wanganui, which provides that, instead of going through this farcical pro- ceeding of staying away, either party to the dispute can lift it right over the head of the Board of Conciliation to the Court of Arbi- tration, and there have the matter decisively settled ? It appears to me there is some under-current in the Premier's mind leading to the speech he has delivered this evening. I can only suppose that the honourable gentleman thinks the speeches he delivered in the House and to these deputations two or three months ago have gone too far, and he is now trying to put the brake on. But I do not think he will be able to put the brake on until this new method which has been passed by both Houses of the Legislature has had a fair trial. For my own part, I believe there are some employers who would prefer to go to the Board of Con- sensible and competent Board the dispute may be settled in its initial stage. In Christchurch we have a Board which, on the whole, acts fairly, and which has secured the confidence of the workers and employers. In connection with some disputes there has been an inclina- tion on the part of the employers to have the matter settled by the Court, but that, I believe, has only been in cases where the matter in dis- pute was somewhat of a colonial character, and they preferred to have an award made that would be as far as possible applicable to the entire colony. What about the Auckland Board of Con-ciliation ? Has anybody made charges against that ? What about the Dunedin Board of Con- ciliation, which, I believe, has the reputation of being the best Board in the colony ? Have there been any complaints regarding that? Not at all. Those Boards conduct their busi- ness in a proper and businesslike way ; but what has happened in Wellington has opened the eyes of Parliament and of the colony to what is possible, and, having learnt what can be done under the labour laws, Parliament has given to the employers the right to say whether they will or will not lift the dispute over the heads of the Conciliation Board. Whenever I go among the employers of the City of Wel- lington I hear nothing but contempt for the Wellington Conciliation Board. I believe it has been stated that that Board never sat more than four hours a day, and it was no uncommon thing for them to cite persons to appear at half-past ten in the morning for the hearing of a case, and for members of the Board to stroll in leisurely at eleven. Can it be wondered, in view of what I have quoted from the speeches of the Premier, that Parlia. ment should say, " We are not going to allow any more of this state of things." I do not want to discuss any more of the amendments made by the Legislative Council, and I would not have risen but that I wanted to put in Hansard that the man who said the Concilia- tion Boards were riding the thing to death was the Premier, and that he said it on two separate and distinct occasions while this Parliament has been sitting; and, further, that it was the speeches of the Premier which fanned the feeling of discontent to such a degree that honourable members took the de- termination that they would try and invent some method by which appeals to the Welling- ton Board of Conciliation might be avoided. Mr. MILLAR (Dunedin City) .- Sir, I wish to say that, as one of those who opposed the amendment of the honourable member for Wanganui, I am to-day of the same opinion as I was then. I believe the House made a mis- take, and, if they had had more time to deal with the question, I doubt very much whether that amendment would have gone on the statute-book. What does it all amount to ? According to the speech of the honourable member for Riccarton and the speech of the honourable member for Palmerston, a great principle, which has been one of the policy measures of this party, is to be sacrificed simply to get at one Board in the colony. That

believe and they say that the Boards in the colony on the whole have done good work, but because of the wrongdoing of this one Board the whole principle is to be allowed to go-and I will show you how the whole thing is to go - by the board. The very thing the honourable member is placing on the statute-book has been done without these amendments at all. Half a dozen cases in this colony have been referred direct to the Arbitration Court by the Board of Conciliation. On the application of both parties the Board has sent the dispute direct to the Arbitration Court to get it settled there. Now, if that has been done in the past, what is to hinder its being done in the future ? But the amendment of the honourable gentle- man is to enable any dissatisfied man to go straight to the Court. What does the honour- able member say? These are his own words : " It should be settled at the earliest possible moment." Now, if it is to be settled at the earliest possible moment, how can it possibly go to the Conciliation Board? Is there any desire to send it to the Board under these con- ditions? I say the honourable gentleman's own speech shows that he desires the disputes to go direct to the Arbitration Court. If this had only come from the honourable gentleman the other night I might have believed there was nothing behind it, but if honourable members will carry their thoughts back over a few weeks they will remember that there was a gentleman over here from New South Wales called Judge Backhouse. He was sent by the New South Wales Government to inquire into the working of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of this colony; and will any honourable member tell me what the employers told him in connection with this? From one end of the colony to the other, so far as the employers were concerned, they advocated that the New South Wales Act should contain no Conciliation Board at all. That is three months ago. I say, looking at it as fairly as one can, that when you put these two things together it appears as if the employers desired to have the Conciliation Boards wiped out. Now, what is the next step? The next step would be that the cases for the Arbitration Court will be so heavy that honourable members will be quoting the cost of the Arbitration Court on the floor of this House, and asking that it be done away with. Hon. MEMBERS .- No, no. Mr. MILLAR .- Sir, the honourable gentle- men may say "No, no," but I was not born yesterday, and I have seen a little too much. I have been mixed up with the labour move- ment 'for eighteen years, and I get a little bit suspicious when I see these things. I have watched this movement for some time. remember on a former occasion it was abso- lutely denied that the object of a certain thing done in this House was for the purpose of re- ducing wages through the Government. But they have never dared deny that in such a form as to enable one to produce evidence with which to confront them, and as I believe that was done at that time. Mr. Millar Mr. MILLAR .- I refer to the appointment of the first Railway Commissioners. One of the principal reasons for appointing the Rail- way Commissioners was to enable them to reduce the wages of the colony, which the private employers did not care about doing. Mr. W. FRASER .- Not at all. Mr. MILLAR .- Will the honourable gentle- man stand on a public platform with me and say what he says now-" Not at all "? Mr. W. FRASER .- Yes. Mr. J. ALLEN .- Yes. Mr. MILLAR .- Very well, I will invite the both of you to go with me on any public plat- form in the colony, and I will produce there evidence to prove what I say. An Hon. MEMBER .- And charge 1s. admis- sion. Mr. MILLAR. - I do not want to charge Is. admission. Sir, the honourable gentleman gave expression to an opinion which I fully con- cur in- namely, that he hoped there would be no ill-feeling betwixt employers and employes. That is the desire of all of us. But, I say. i. this likely to engender good feeling ? Is it likely when a feeling has got hold of one section of the community that a certain thing is about to be done, and the very thing that they suspect is done - is that likely to create good feeling ? Sir, I venture to say this-and I am sorry to say it, because I am one of those who have strong!y opposed the formation of a distinct Labour parts in this colony. I have always advocated that we should throw our lot in with those with whom we are most in accord, and support them ; but I say that nothing has done mere to create a distinct Labour party in this colony than the action which has been taken dur- ing the last two or three days, and that we have not to wait very long

before that is proved. Now, there is one thing I am pleased about, and that is that the right honouralle gentleman has said he will introduce an ameud- ing Bill next session. I say it is only right he should bring in that amendment next sess :. r. This Bill has been completely altered from the original form. It has been done surreptitiously. It will be nine or ten months before we can meet again, and the Premier should then intr .- duce that Bill, and give members a fair opret- tunity of discussing it and voting on it. seeits that we are going to the country, where the question can be settled. I for one, if the honourable gentleman does not do as he has promised now, will certainly endeavour to brini up a Bill myself and have the question settiet I think it is only right, on a great policy ma - sure such as this is, that before any radical alteration is made the country ought to have a fair opportunity of expressing an opinia upon it. I have known of some of the I honourable gentlemen supporting this course. and I could turn up speeches in Hansard and show where they have stood on the floor of this House and said that, in the case of a great alteration in our policy such as this is, the country ought to be consuited before it is put into effect. I have known another place to hang up Bills session after

<page:1083>

expressing its opinion on the matter, but we have not seen that done in this case. I do not blame another place for having passed this, because this House did so first, and they were only doing, to my mind, their duty in passing it as we passed it ; and I certainly think the Premier would have made a mistake if he had endeavoured in any shape or form to thwart the wish of members of both Houses of Par- liament ; but he can give an opportunity in the early part of next session to go into this matter and see what can be done. I, for one, am the last man in the colony to try and excite ill-feeling betwixt employer and employé, because it is no advantage to one side or the other; but I say there is bitterness of feeling now, and, further, that the agitation is going beyond the towns now and to the country. And you cannot blame the Labour party for it, because when the party see these attacks made on them-and they are in a majority in this colony-they will organize as they have never organized before ; and I ask honourable members, Is that a state of things you want to see either in the country or in the House? I say the one is dependent on the other, and everything we can do to create good feeling ought to be done by every member in this House. Now, Sir, as to the special Boards of Conciliation the honourable gentle- man talks of, I say they were in the Act before ever he moved his amendment. I pointed it out at the time when I saw the drift he was going in. Mr. WILLIS .- Only in cases of emergency. Mr. MILLAR .- The honourable gentleman says, " Only in cases of emergency." Is every dis- pute not a case of emergency? Both sides, if they agree to go to a special Board, could set one up at any time. I say, even if the honour- able member desired to obtain his object, he could do it by striking out the word " both " and putting in "either "; but if I had known the honourable gentleman intended to move that they should go to the Court afterwards this Bill would never have gone on the statute-book, because I, for one, would never have agreed to allow these special Boards of Conciliation if 1 had thought the honourable gentleman was going to the Court afterwards. Then, as to the objection the honourable gentleman took to the Conciliation Boards. Heasked : "How could you expect a butcher or a baker to settle the dispute in any other trade ?" I would like to ask the honourable gentleman, if a butcher or baker is not competent to give an opinion on the Con- ciliation Boards, how is he competent to do it on the Arbitration Court ? Mr. WILLIS .- That is different ; the Judge is a trained man. Mr. MILLAR .- Then, if it comes to that we might as well wipe out the Arbitration Court and hand it over to the Judge. It means no- thing else. You have got now under the Act a Conciliation Board, you have got a special Board of Conciliators, and you have got the Arbitration Court, and yet, according to the honourable gentleman's own evidence, the case, should go direct to the Court. The honour- able gentleman said, at the earliest possible moment these cases should and would be settled. The honourable gentleman will not argue that by taking it first to the Conciliation Board, either special or ordinary, and from there to the Court, that that is going to be the earliest possible method of settling this

dispute. Still, the whole principle was to get concilia- tion in the first place. It was thought when the Act first passed that it would only be a matter of a very short time before the Concilia- tion Boards would do everything ; and what has been the cause of the failure ? Has it been any. fault of the Boards ? Hon. MEMBERS .- Yes. Mr. MILLAR .- The honourable gentleman may say that, but I think I will prove dif- ferently. Human nature is human nature all the world over : it does not matter whether it is employer or employé. Now, what has been the working of the Board ? The two parties to the dispute go before the Board. One side. gets an award against it, more or less. It costs them nothing to go to the higher Court ; they cannot lose anything by going to a higher Court, and they go to the Court. An Hon. MEMBER .- Do they do that in Dun- edin ? Mr. MILLAR .- Yes; just the same as any- where else. An Hon. MEMBER .- Did not the Board there settle a good many cases ? Mr. MILLAR .- Yes; 1 admit we settled a few cases, but we had the same thing to con- tend with right through. I think the honour- able member for Riccarton or the honour- able member for Christchurch City said that every employer approved of conciliation. Sir, if the honourable gentleman had sat, as I have, on Conciliation Boards, and seen employer after employer trooping up and complaining that they did not know what they were called there for, and saying that they had no dispute at all, the honourable gentleman would simply be sur- prised. One after another would come up and deny that any dispute existed between them and their employés. I trust that when the Bill comes up next session honourable members will look at it apart from any feeling with which they may regard any particular Board in the colony. Honourable members read the news- papers, and it is strange that inflammatory articles have appeared in the Press ever since the award was given against the newspaper- proprietors. Mr. PIRANI .- The award was in their favour. Mr. MILLAR .- I am coming to that point. Up to the time when they were brought before the Board little or nothing was said in the newspapers. Now, what was the award of the Conciliation Board in Wellington? Will any one say it was in favour of the employers ? Mr. PIRANI. - Yes; the Typographical So- ciety was going to dissolve over it. Mr. MILLAR. - Was the recommendation of the Board in favour of the employers ?
<page:1084>
of the Arbitration Court was. Mr. MILLAR .- Exactly ; and the Arbitration Court in Auckland settled the case on infinitely worse terms than had been given in Dunedin and Wellington. No less than 12s. less was given ; and it was admitted that a mistake had been made, because, from the evidence as to the wages made in Australia and as to the wages made even in London by the linotype workers, it was shown they were somewhere about 30s. in advance of what the Arbitration Court gave. The honourable member for Palmerston knows very well that is so. He knows what wages are given to the compositors in London. I went through the case myself, and it was an eye-opener to me. Since then the employers have voluntarily given the men a rise of 6s. per week over the award of the Arbitration Court. Mr. PIRANI .- That shows their fairness. Mr. MILLAR .- Well, I am not making any attack on the employers. I simply wish to say it is a strange thing that up to the time of the award the newspapers had little to say. During the last three months there have been two or three awards which have gone more in favour of the employers than formerly, and sometimes I begin to think that is the reason why this par- ticular regard for the Arbitration Court is in existence at the present time. I have no doubt, if the pendulum swings back and the Arbitra- tion Court happens to give four or five awards that do not please the employers, the Concilia- tion Board will be thought more of. How- ever, I trust that when the Bill comes be- fore us next year we will reinstate the power of conciliation. If it is thought a Stipendiary Magistrate should be Chairman of the Board of Conciliation, let it be put in the Act. That is easily done. I certainly believe that concilia- #cc-zero tion at first is the principal thing in disputes if you wish to promote that good feeling we all pro- fess so much, and forward the desire to get em- ployer and employed to work in unity. I say that the majority of the employers will not go to the Board. In the next eight or nine months we will see what course will be taken. There will be plenty of awards in that time, and when we meet next year I believe I will be told that what I

am saying on the floor of the House now is correct-that the majority, and the large majority, of the employers will go direct to the Arbitration Court. If such should be the result, it ultimately means, of course, the wiping-out of the Conciliation Boards, and, in- stead of being conciliation and arbitration, it will be compulsory arbitration. Mr. HUTCHESON (Wellington City) .- Sir, when the Hon. Mr. Reeves was introducing this Bill in 1894 he used these words :- " I do not think the Arbitration Court will be very often called into requisition ; on the contrary, I think that in ninety cases out of a hundred in which labour disputes arise they will be settled by the Conciliation Boards." How far the honourable gentleman's prognos- tications have been borne out by experience honourable members can judge. In the amend- cally accepted by the Legislative Council, I submit that for the first time since the origin of the Act in the colony we have now got means provided for conciliation. Never before was the machinery provided for conciliation. It is true we had an institution called the Con- ciliation Board, but it must not be forgotten that in nearly every case one party to every case came unwillingly. He came under com- pulsion. How, then, could there be the elements for conciliation? The honourable member for Dunedin City says we must deal with human nature as we find it, and I ask him to apply that aphorism to his own case, and say how conciliatory he would feel if he were compelled to do something he did not want to do, and which was distasteful to him. It is not in human nature. But this amending Bill, which I hope will become law, provides three tribunals for the settlement of industrial disputes. The old Boards as already consti- tuted are still open for the use of those parties who, by mutual consent, desire to use them. Then we have the Board of experts, available to either party to invoke, but only to be used pro- vided that one party secures the mutual consent of the other party to the dispute. Next we have the real machinery of the Act, that all experience has shown us has power and is com- petent to deal with the settlement of disputes- namely, the Arbitration Court. Now, to both employers and employés time is money, and vexatious, wearisome delays in attending the Conciliation Board, only to be told an adjourn- ment is to be made, the waste of time, and the irritation and annoyance ensuing from that waste of time, are surely not calculated to Now, bring about a spirit of conciliation. although the Premier and other members of the Ministry have spoken in most conflicting terms during the last month or two, I say, if left to their own resources, the Government would not have introduced the two elements contained in clauses 6 and 21 unless a ma- jority of the House had taken the matter into their own hands. The real fact of the matter is that for the last five or six years we have had no Minister of Labour. We have had the Right Hon. the Premier running the Department of Labour as a kind of side-show. discharging the duties in a most perfunctory manner, and being guided at times by the advice of his officers, at times by deputations from the Employers' Association, and at times by deputations of workers. He has been the victim of conflicting advice and influence during the whole time he has been in office. That the right honourable gentleman has only done his work perfunctorily was demonstrated to the House a few nights ago when another Labour Bill was before us. The honourable gentleman admitted he had not even seen it in print. It was an egregious blunder to make, and a back-set to the cause of labour. Now, regarding the im- portant changes proposed in clauses 6 and 21. no honourable member can say we are not now acting on the advice of the permanent head of the Labour Department. Let us take the

<page:1085>

Labour for 1898. Here he predicts the neces- sity for change : - "Another proposal is that the decision of Conciliation Boards should be made binding if the parties to the suit agree to the Board's recommendation. Much time is now wasted by cases being heard before the Board when it is the expressed intention of the litigants to carry such cases on to the Court whatever the recommendation of the Board may be. This arises from the fact that the Board has not the power to bind the parties to any particular course of action, and therefore the decision of the higher Court, which has the effect of law, must be invoked. Whether it is desirable to destroy the principle of conciliation by giving the Board the

powers of a tribunal is questionable, but it would certainly be an immense gain from the point of view of economy, and would remove a feeling of irritation from the minds of members of Boards who at present sometimes consider their time needlessly wasted." So we have two principles clearly indicated : The economy of the time of all the parties concerned, the economy of the cost to the State, and the economy of the saving of irritation and annoyance that must further aggravate the particular dispute. That is a report of the Labour Department so far back as the year 1898. Now, coming to the year 1900, we have a still more direct and emphatic recommendation :- " It has been suggested that entire alteration in the system of Conciliation Boards is neces- sary, and I am of opinion that the arguments adduced for such change are so strong as to be worthy the serious attention of the Govern- ment." He goes on further to say,- "Such a Board, both on the scores of eco- nomy and experience, would be more competent and carry more weight in its recommendation than a Board constituted under the present Act. Much time is now wasted when, say, a tailor, a baker, a butcher, and a carter, with a clergy- man or lawyer in the chair, have to decide on technical points of dispute concerning, say, bootmakers, wharf-labourers, or printers. They know absolutely nothing even of the A BC of such employments." He is stating the actual constitution of the Board in Wellington. As a matter of fact, it had a lawyer and, without disrespect, has now an ex-clergyman as Chairman of the Board. He continues,- " Even if costly experts are called in to assist and explain terms and systems to the Board, time and money are lost. If this could be avoided by having Conciliation Boards of ex- perts in each particular case, the gain is evi- dent. On the other hand, it is certain that there would be some drawbacks to the pro- posed scheme, even if they are not apparent at this moment. The thoughtful opinions of men whose interests are likely to be affected should be invited before so far-reaching an alteration is attempted. " Suggestions for still another vital amend- ment have been received from different locali- ties and from representatives of both employers and employed. It is that, in case both parties to a dispute agree, the Conciliation Board should be passed by altogether, and the case commenced in the Arbitration Court. There is no doubt that valuable time is lost by suitors before the Conciliation Board when there is an expressed determination by one party or the other not to take notice of the Board's recommendation whatever it may be, but to proceed to the Arbi- tration Court for the sake of the power to bind possessed by the Court and not by the Board." Now, if the House will admit that the Minis- ter of Labour has not devoted to these measures the solicitous care and attention necessary for him to understand the exact trend of the work- ing of the existing law, who, then, is it to be guided by but by the responsible officer of his department ? and if he has not accepted that guidance, surely the House is justified, failing the honourable gentleman himself, in embody- ing these recommendations in the amending Act. Now, we have the authority of the expert of the Labour Department for these two prin- ciples we have put into the amending Bill now before us. Mr. MILLAR .- There were Boards of experts put in last year. Mr. HUTCHESON .- Just so ; but they were only available when both parties to the dispute were in agreement. Now, what is the effect of the amendment of the present Act? One party that desires a Board of experts in their own trade will approach the other party to the dispute and ask them if they will agree to have their case heard by experts, and I make bold to say that in the case of those who are working under intricate logs and technical logs that Board will be adopted every time. I do not believe that, for instance, the tailors would go on with a new case to the Arbitration Court and fail to avail themselves of the other Board of experts here expressly provided for them. How intelligible to the outsider are innumer- able technical terms in the tailors' log I will leave honourable gentlemen to imagine when I ask what the ordinary landsman would under- stand if I told him, in the terms of the sailor's log, that the accident was caused by "a thorougfoot in the clew-garnet." That may seem rather involved to many honourable mem- bers, but there are no other words by which I can express that statement ; and so it is with many claims that have highly technical terms in connection with their craft. Supposing, for instance, one party in every case shall elect to go direct to the Arbitration Court. Is not that almost the case at

present ? and, if we judge by the results, how much would we lose ? What settlements would we lose ? Two cases in Canterbury, two in Otago, six in Auckland, and, I think, two completely settled in Wellington. Now, it is quite true I may be told there is a great deal of the preliminary en- tanglement straightened out and cleared away by the Board.
<page:1086>
accepts the Board's recommendation. Mr. HUTCHESON .- Very well, let us as- sume that it will entail a much larger expense upon the Court. But I ask honourable mem- bers, supposing the settlement of all disputes in the future is dependent entirely upon the Arbitration Court, whether the annual cost is likely to exceed the sum of money expended last year on Boards and Courts -namely, about $3,500. The cost for all the cases finally decided by the Court last year was only $1,659 9s. 9d., as against £1,811 11s. 11d. for conciliation. Now, the honourable member for Dunedin City sought to score a point from one of the previous speakers in saying that he was justified in concluding from the arguments the honourable member mentioned that in order to get at that one particular Board the whole system was assailed, or words to that effect. Mr. MILLAR. - " Sacrificed." Mr. HUTCHESON .- Well, it is not so with me. I have no such desire, because I hope to see conciliation carried on in the true spirit-the only conceivable spirit in which conciliation can be carried on-that is, where both parties are mutually agreed to endeavour to compromise, and give and take, and settle the dispute with- out an appeal to the force of the Court. Only under those conditions has the term " concilia- tion " any meaning whatever. I may be par- ticularly crass and stubborn, and I know very well that if anybody compelled me to do a thing I would have a spirit of hostility to- wards that compulsion, and would resist it as long as possible, and it is human nature to do so. The only means of bringing the parties together in the present state of the law is to bring one of them at least by the hair of the head. It is impossible to conciliate under those circumstances. It is true that one particular Board has demonstrated to the House what abuses are possible under the law. That Board has been a finger-post to show us what can happen. The Wellington Board has settled fewer cases than some of the other Boards, and yet it has cost three times more than the Auckland Board, five times more than the Otago, ten times more than Canterbury, sixty-four times more than Westland, 106 times more than Taranaki, and two and a half times more than all the other Boards put together. Now, that is a pretty bad record ; but that only shows what a really bad Board can do-it does not kill the principle of the Act. I distinctly believe that the Legislature has done the right thing to maintain the permanency and utility of the Act. I feel certain that no great hard- ship will be imposed upon anybody. The Bill provides that the parties may go to the ordi- nary Board, or to a Board of experts from the particular trade, and they may elect to go direct to the Court; and I fail to see where any hardship can obtain. When the Pre- mier said to-night that it is a radical amend- ment of the Act, and that it was made in a surreptitious manner in the small hours of the morning by a House excited out of its ordinary reasonable frame of mind, and from employer or employé, I could not help being struck with the audacity of this fresh evidence of his well-known capacity as an exponent of the art of misrepresentation. Why, he himself has been importuned, and the per- manent expert of the Labour Department has been importuned by every interest in the colony, time and again, for those two privileges- namely, for a Board of experts with a practical knowledge of the technicalities of the trade, and for the right of direct appeal to the Arbi- tration Court. I will give one or two instances. A deputation from one of the labour unions, headed by Mr. Allan Orr, waited on the Pre- mier on the 6th August, and here is part of what the right honourable gentleman said on that occasion :- "The same evidence was repeated ad nau- seam, and the business of the Board was clogged by unnecessary repetitions. In the meantime business was paralysed, a fact which seriously affected employers and employés alike. The result was that both sides were getting sick of it. The employers did not want to be everlastingly in a turmoil. The unionists would have to act with great circum- spection, or they would destroy the usefulness of the Act." On Labour Day, at the Basin Reserve, the Premier told the unions in

very much the same terms that the employers were the cause of all the failures on the Board; so that the honourable gentleman is between the devil and the deep sea in the haphazard way in which he is endeavouring to administer the Act. The fact of the matter is that the honourable gentleman's policy in regard to these labour Bills, is very much the policy of the "Pious Editor " in the " Biglow Papers " :- It aint by principles nor men My preudent course is stidied : I scent which pays the best, and then Go into it bald-headed. It is the vote-value that controls his attitude in regard to these labour laws. It is not a question of principle, it is a question of votes. If he had not counted noses by this time, do you think he would have moved a resolution agreeing to the amendments made in this Bill ? But he has counted noses, and he knows that the numbers are against him, and therefore he has made a virtue of necessity, and with great sound of trumpets, and with many threats and warnings, he has told us he is going to bow to the will of the Legislature. Now, I do no: share the pessimistic views of the member for Dunedin City (Mr. Millar) regarding the pos- sible effect of these amendments. It may be quite true that it would be possible for us to rub along with the present Conciliation Boards -that is, if the right men were always elected. Give me a bad Act and good administration, and I will make the very worst Act tolerable to the people. With regard to the evidence taken by Judge Backhouse, I am inclined to think that what the bulk of the employers recommended was that there should be some preliminary tri- bunal for the clearing-away of the technicalities

<page:1087>

throwing an intelligible picture on the screen for the Court to give its decision upon, but that the constitution of the Boards should be altered in the direction the Legislature is now about to do. That is my view of the matter, and I believe this Bill will enable that to be done ; and I feel the greatest solicitude for the success of this Bill in the direction of settling industrial disputes. Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) .- Sir, there is no difficulty in definitely fixing the author- ship of the phrase that "the labour unions were riding the labour laws to death." That has already been done. All that was said by the honourable member for Riccarton in regard to the authorship of that phrase, and a good deal more, will be found in my speech on the third reading of the Factories Bill on the 14th October (Hansard, No. 30, page 377). I do not object to that point being made more definite, because somebody will have to answer some day for the difficulties that have arisen and the friction that has been created in consequence of the Premier having made that statement. He himself is endeavouring to escape by cast- ing the blame upon anybody and everybody else, and that kind of tactics he regards as manly and honourable. Before referring to the amendments made by the Legislative Council in the Bill I wish to say, in regard to the criti- cisms of the Wellington Board, that I am de- barred from defending or palliating the action of that Board for a very obvious reason. I am tongue-tied. Neither did I vote on clause 21, the clause of the honourable member for Wa- nganui, which was adopted in Committee on the Bill on the 3rd October, for the same reason. At three o'clock in the morning there #cc-zero were two divisions, one on the motion of the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Hutcheson), "That no person in the employ of the Government should be elected a mem- ber of the Board or Court," the other on the now celebrated clause No. 21 proposed by the member for Wanganui. I abstained from voting on both. That prompts me to call attention to this point : That morning the House rose at half-past four, the members pre- sent being weary and distressed. Some weeks before the Government put before us for dis- cussion a useless measure like the Cook Islands Annexation Bill. We were asked to discuss that useless Bill in broad daylight, when mem- bers were awake, and had their wits about them ; yet we are called upon to discuss an im- portant measure like this until half-past four o'clock in the morning. Even now, here we are at the very last stage of the Bill, and the Premier is not in the House to watch its pro- gress through that last important stage. This remark will, of course, be repeated to him when he returns from the function which is being given to a distinguished visitor, and he will then, no doubt, complainingly ask why, if he wishes to attend a function given to a

distinguished visitor, he may not be allowed to do so. The answer at once is that we all, as members of Parliament, will to-morrow meet luncheon to be given to him in these buildings. I say the Premier ought to be in his place to- night while we are reviewing the final stage of a Bill so seriously affecting the welfare of the working-classes. Now, Sir, if the Premier had laid down a definite line of action-if he had adopted and followed a straight course in regard to this whole question-I would have been with him all the time, but I cannot follow him in his ducking and diving from one position to another. The slipperiness of the eel and the diving of the shag are nothing to it. If he would say that he had got himself into a hole, I would help him out. But one day he says, "the labour unions are riding the labour laws to death," the next day he denounces the em- ployers, and works himself up into an unneces- sary state of fury, just as we have seen to-night. He tells us the employers are responsible for all the trouble that has been brought about. What are we to do? We are asked to de- nounce the labour unions ; we are asked to denounce the employers. We cannot do both. Now, just mark this : The Bill emerged from Committee at half-past four o'clock on the morning of the 3rd October, after the Com- mittee had passed the two clauses which the honourable gentleman has since so many times so furiously denounced-clause 6, proposed by the member for Palmerston, and clause 21, proposed by the member for Wanganui. To- night, again, he complains bitterly of the action of the House in passing those two clauses. Now, listen to this, Sir, and ask yourself whether you can think such things to be conceivable. Have we eyes? Have we ears? At four o'clock in the morning, after the Com- mittee had passed these very clauses, he con- gratulated the House upon what it had done. In summing up the debate on the motion for the third reading of the Bill he said (Hansard, No. 27, page 177) :- "I am in a position to congratulate the House on this occasion. I think our time has been well spent, and I am sorry that some of the speeches we had on the Bill in Committee were not reported, because I am sure they would have given to the world a general explanation of the labour laws, and would have met to a great extent the objections that are raised against their working." He congratulates the House, and says its time has been well spent ! Again I ask, Have we eyes ; have we ears? And then, speaking of the employers who come to Parliament to seek redress, he says, - "I say that Parliament is the high Court to which every person in the colony has the right to appeal." Contrast this with what he has said to-night and what he said at the Labour Day Demon- stration in Wellington on Wednesday, the 9th October. His speech on the third reading of the Bill goes on to show that he cheerfully accepted the amendments of the member for Palmerston and the member for Wanganui when the Bill was in Committee, for he says,- " I may say, too, that it does not encourage
<page:1088>
after I have done so, the honourable gentleman tells me that I have had to accept the amend- ments, that I have had to swallow bitter pills, and that the Bill itself has been so mangled by the acceptance of these amendments that practically it is unworkable. I say I do not think that should come from the honourable member. It does not encourage one to accept amendments, and I have accepted them because I believe they will improve the working of the law, and that they will remove some existing difficulties. When one accepts amendments in a proper spirit, and with a desire to perfect our legislation, it is too bad for the honourable member to use the terms and language com- plained of." Clearly he had accepted the amendments willingly-" I have accepted them .because I believe they will improve the working of the law." And yet he has the temerity to-night to denounce my honourable friend the mem- ber for Wanganui for having proposed that clause. An Hon. MEMBER .- He never supported that clause. Mr. FISHER .- What is it to me whether he supported it or not ? He says, "I have ac- cepted them (the amendments) because I be- lieve they will improve the working of the law." Having accepted them, why does he denounce them ? Will any one explain ? Going on in his speech to another point, he says,- "It is with regret I notice that a num- ber of people in the colony, the moment when one has the courage to point out a defect "- [He is referring here to his having said that "the labour unions were riding the labour laws to death "]-"or call

attention to a con- dition of things which is unsatisfactory-Parlia- ment having done its work well, and the law working well with the exception of one or two cases, where there was a necessity for plain speaking-such people spread misleading state- ments. I repeat, I have never stated the labour laws passed were injurious. I have never seen the Act used against the employers for the benefit of the employés; nor have I seen it used to the detriment of the workers." There is still no denunciation of the honour- able member for Wanganui, for the honourable gentleman goes on to say,- "I believe at the present moment, notwith- standing the great activity with respect to adjustments of the last few months, that the feeling between employer and employé through- out the colony is better than in any other part of the world.' And now I must ask honourable members to listen to this marvellous and astounding con- clusion-marvellous and astounding, viewed in the light of his rampings and his ragings of to-night :- "I am very pleased with our night's work, and if all our Bills and legislation were dealt with as we have dealt with the conciliation and arbitration question to-night it would be to the credit of the House, the representatives of the Mr. Fisher the great majority of the people of the colony." Do we dream ? Have we eyes? Have we ears ? And then, after the Bill was read a third time, in moving the adjournment of the House, the Premier said, -- "I move, That the House do now adjourn. I regret having detained members so long to- night, but we have been engaged upon very good work, and, I think, with a satisfactory re- sult. The fact of passing the Bill unanimously is proof positive that we are all satisfied with the labour laws of the colony and our own labours to-night." Now, having listened to the honouralle gentleman's ravings to-night, will any one please tell me plainly what they think? He says the House " has been engaged in very good work," and that " we are all satisfied with the labour laws of the colony and our own labours to-night." With that I take my leave of the honourable gentleman. My object in 10.30. putting together these speeches of the honourable gentleman is this : If it is profitable or advantageous to him to pursue this course in dealing with the labour laws of this country, let him do so, but I will not follow in his train. I wish to keep my position with the labour people of this colony, and with the work- ing-classes of this city clear and well de. fined. I say plainly-and it is a matter of extreme regret to me that the Premier is not present to hear what I am saying. because I prefer to say anything I have to say to a man's face, and not behind his back. The honourable gentleman ought to be here to listen to this debate right through. I have said that the Premier, in moving that the amendments made by the Legislative Council be agreed to, lashed himself into a state of fury. It was quite unnecessary, but it must be remembered that the honourable gentleman finds himself in a position of great difficulty- a difficulty entirely of his own creation, arising out of the contrariety of his statements-state- ments of an emphatic kind made one day to one class of persons, and statements of an equally emphatic kind made another day to another class of persons. The difficulty, as I have previously explained, which we labour under is this: that while we are willing to follow the Government of which we are the recognised supporters, we find it difficult w> follow the honourable gentleman in what I have previously termed his serpentine course. It may be easy for him to explain one view of a particular question to one set of persons on one day, and a totally opposite view of the same question to another set of persons on another day, but it is not easy for us, the supporters of the Government, to do that. We are faced with this question : " Are you a legitimate supporter of labour legislation and a supporter of the Go- vernment, or are you not?" To that question I answer for myself distinctly, Yes, I am a supporter of labour legislation and a supporter of the Government. But I also say that it is necessary for me to lay down my position clearly in this House, for I cannot give, as the honour-

of persons and another statement to another set of persons. That is not my way. I tell you, Sir, deliberately, calmly, and without any warmth of feeling, that I cannot do it, and, moreover, I do not intend to do it. The labour classes -- the workers- of this colony have no stronger, no more earnest advocate in this coun- try than 1. I have supported all our labour legislation from the first, and have followed it loyally,

and without deviation of any kind ; and I say that there would have been no such difficulty as that with which we are now confronted at the present moment but for the diverse statements made by the Premier, and which have been quite impartially commended and condemned by the newspapers throughout New Zealand, and by the newspapers in all the principal cities of Austra- lia. So accurate is the view, so accurate is the gauge, taken by the newspapers of Australia upon that first statement of the Premier in regard to the labour unions of the colony "riding the labour laws to death," that every newspaper has commented upon it in its strongest possible terms-some, as I have said, in terms of commendation, and some in terms of condemnation. But none have made the least mistake as to the statement, or as to the author of the statement. And that is the difficulty in which I and others in this House find our- selves. In consequence of the contrary state- ments made by the Premier, he being the leader of the Government and the Minister of Labour- the leader of the labour party in this country- I find myself constantly on the defence. I am asked, "Why did you not support the state- ment of the Premier?" I answer, " Which statement ? That is not the statement he made two days ago." If I am referred to the statement he made two days ago, and am asked, "Why did you not support that? " I answer, "That is not the statement he made a few days before. Which of the three do you mean ?" And the people are so mixed up, they really do not know which they mean. Perhaps I may be pardoned for describing my own charac- ter. I like a direct method of arriving at a cer- tain result. Anything in the nature of shuffling or circumlocution is contrary to my nature. It goes without saying that on an important question like this -a question affecting the labour classes of this country-I have but one opinion. That opinion is that I will support steadfastly their interests in this Parliament so long as they are good enough to place me here. In criticizing the Conciliation Boards of the colony I wish to say that I agree entirely with the honourable member for Dunedin City (Mr. Millar). I say with him that it was not neces- sary to sacrifice the Conciliation Boards of the colony in order to deal with the shortcomings of one Board. If the proceedings of one parti- cular Board were in any way defective the Government, by legislation or by other means, ought to have improved the methods and the ways of that Board. As a matter of policy, it was a mistake to do anything that would tend to destroy the Conciliation Boards, because inherently the system is a good system. VOL. CXIX .- 68. to the statement of the member for Palmers- ton (Mr. Pirani) that the Conciliation Boards had their uses. They were useful in dealing with the voluminous technical details with which it is absurd to trouble the superior Court ; and the objection to the Conciliation Boards would, I believe, have been removed if the Government had introduced a clause pro- viding that the Boards, instead of being pre- sided over by a layman, should be presided over by some gentleman possessing the qualifica- tions of, say, a Resident Magistrate-some gentleman accustomed to analyse evidence and winnow the grain from the chaff, and so to conduct the proceedings of the Board as to command the attention and respect of em- ployers and employed. If the Boards had been presided over by men having some legal knowledge, but having with them labour representatives sitting on the Board to ex- plain the technicalities of each dispute, that would have been the class of Board I would like to see established. Then we would not have witnessed the waste of time and the crudity in the conduct of the proceedings which un- doubtedly-it is no use denying it-we have been called upon to witness. To my mind that remedy was easy without resorting to the extreme of abolishing the Conciliation Boards- for practically we may regard them as abolished. The employers now have the right, if they so please, to pass by the Conciliation Boards; but I say still, optional as clause 21 of the member for Wanganui is, that if the Conci- liation Boards so conduct their proceedings in any cases that may come before them as tc command respect, the employers will prefer to gc before the Board rather than to the Court. So soon as they convince the community that it is their desire to settle cases brought before them with expedition, I believe the parties to a dispute would still prefer to go before the Con- ciliation Boards. But the belief must be entirely dispelled that the Conciliation Boards are conducted with a certain object. I am not putting this offensively. I have been barred from

speaking about the Wellington Board for an obvious reason- well, the fact is, my brother is a member of the Board, and therefore I have felt a difficulty in speaking upon that phase of the subject. But I am sure that if the Board will endeavour to convince the public of their desire to settle cases to the best of their ability, with an honest desire to arrive at re- sults regardless of guineas, they would still command the respect of the people. It cannot be denied that they have had a difficult and thankless duty to perform. I have had these imputations hurled at me in my day. Now, the Minister of Labour has moved that the amendments made by the Legislative Council be agreed to. He has accepted the flat It would have been of the Legislature. unwise to attempt to foil the well-grounded and decided result at which both branches of the Legislature had arrived. The majorities in both Houses are sufficient to indicate what I the Parliament and the people of the country

<page:1090>

bow to the inevitable. But, as the member for Dunedin City (Mr. Millar) remarked, clause 21 will only be put in operation for one year. The public will have the advantage of judging of the effect of this clause upon the admi- nistration of the labour laws. If it proves satisfactory, then the Legislature-and in par- ticular the member for Wanganui-will be entitled to all the credit derivable from that result. If it is not satisfactory, we, as labour members-the members for Dunedin, Christ- church, Wellington, and Auckland-the city members-will see that the Conciliation Boards are reinstituted. I group them as the labour members. We are here to say, as to the result of one year's working of clause 21, if its ope- ration is not satisfactory to those concerned- employers and employed-it shall be altered. We are a solid phalanx. It does not matter on which side of the House we sit, for I give those sitting on the opposite side in politics as much credit as I claim for myself in the endeavour to perfect this legislation ; and if this clause is not an improvement on the existing law, then we will change it. Let us, then, accept the result as it is, agree to the amendments, and come down next year and say whether any change is necessary. The aim of the Legislature, I feel convinced, Sir, from my knowledge of the members of both sides of the House, is to con- oiliate. That is the desire of every member of the House, whether he be a labour mem- ber or not. We desire to set up a tribunal which will do away with all friction between employer and employed; and that is only possible by wisely yielding, one side to the other. You want to deal not with the extremists of either side : you want to deal with the wise heads-the wise men-of both sides. People of extreme ideas are not the people to determine large and important ques- tions such as this. It is the men who dissect, who sift, who weigh, as we in this House have to dissect, to sift, to weigh, who are best fitted to decide these questions. I admit the diffi- culty-we must all admit the difficulty-but I do not admit that there is any possibility of the settlement of that difficulty by the adoption of the sinuous and tortuous course taken by the Premier in this matter. If the Premier had boldly submitted one definite plan and said, " I think this best for the industrial classes of the community "-I would not care what it was -I would have followed him. I would not care what course he chose, provided it was one straight-out plan, having the re- commendation that it was the outcome of a bona fide and honest desire to settle the difficulty. Then the honourable gentleman could not have failed ; but I never knew success to follow any attempt to pursue three different courses at one and the same time. I hope the workers of this city will understand that. am here to represent their interests to the best of my ability. If the Premier disagrees with the introduction of clause 21, the clause of the honourable member for Wanganui, he could have stopped the progress of the Bill at the Mr. Fisher. do report progress. But, on the contrary, when the amendments made in Committee were reported to the House, including clause 21, he said,- "I am very pleased with our night's work, and if all our Bills and legislation were dealt with as we have dealt with the conciliation and arbitration question to-night, it would be to the credit of the House, the representatives of the people, and, I believe, in the best interests of the great majority of the people of the colony." Will the honourable gentleman explain bis conduct ? I cannot understand it. Sir J. G. WARD (Minister for Railways) .- Sir, one

thing that has struck me in listening to the debate that has proceeded this evening is the fact that some honourable members, like the last honourable gentleman who has spoken, while professing their anxiety to see the main- tenance of Conciliation Boards, immediately commenced by finding fault with the course taken by the Right Hon. the Premier. It would appear to me as though there were almost concerted action on the part of certain honourable members, who are endeavouring to score off what they are pleased to say is the double course followed by the Hon. the Pre- mier, in view of his having given expression to concern at the administration of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act some time ago and the action he has taken in opposing clause 21 as amended by the motion of the honourable member for Wanganui, Mr. Willis. Now, I think it is very unfair, very unjust, and not proper political warfare to try to place a false position before the House or before the country in connection with the action of the Right Hon. the Premier in this matter. I deprecate very strongly what several mem- bers of the House, and certainly the last speaker, have done. I will endeavour to show honourable members that one should not give too much weight to criticism which, if de- livered impartially, would be entitled to very considerable weight. These remarks apply to several of the speeches and to much of the criticism this evening. Now, as to the speech delivered by the Premier, from which the honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Fisher) quoted earlier in the evening to show that he was inconsistent in this matter, I say that the honourable member ought to have quoted the Premier's remarks in full, and particularly he should have read his remarks in Hansard concerning clause 21. I will do so. The Pre- mier said,- "Then, with regard to the amendment carried on the motion of the member for Wanganui, Mr. Willis, I am afraid, Sir, that on reflection there will be a change of opinion in the minds of honourable gentlemen. I do not think that, because it has been alleged the I working of one Conciliation Board has been unsatisfactory, we should have endeavoured to wipe out practically the Conciliation Boards of the colony. "Mr. PIRANI .-- That will not be the effect.

<page:1091>

the effect of Mr. Willis's amendment ; and, if so, I shall regret it, because it will mean that the industrial unions, who elect a member of the Conciliation Board in each case, will believe the employers flout them by taking cases beyond the Conciliation Board to the Court. In the first instance, it is bound to cause a feel- ing of friction, in my opinion, with the workers. The result of it will be, I fear, that their in- terest will wane as regards conciliation, because you must carry with you as you go along the moral support of those interested-the workers -you must carry them with you, and get them to recognise they have had fair play, and that in what has been done they have been con- sulted, and that justice has been done to them. If, on the contrary, they take the bit in their teeth and say they have not been treated fairly, but have been taken at once to the Court, and have not first had the opportunity of con- ference with their employers, and consequently of an explanation before the Conciliation Board - which was the tribunal set up for that pur- pose-and that they have been forced to the Court, in my opinion, it will create a feeling of resentment, and that moral force which must be behind and which is essential to and of paramount importance to the working of the Act will be interfered with by what has been done. I still think it would have been wiser, if there was to be a change at all, that both parties should consent before any dispute could be taken beyond the Conciliation Board to the Arbitration Court, because if they ignored the Conciliation Board, and take the cases to the Arbitration Court it will cause a revulsion of feeling that will be against the good working of the law. I shall hope that that may not be the case." That was what the Premier said on that particular clause. Earlier in the evening we heard the honourable member for Wellington City and the honourable member for Riccarton endeavouring to make out that the Premier was acting inconsistently, and that he had virtually assented to clause 21. Mr. PIRANI .- I rise to a point of order. Is it in order to read an extract from a Hansard report of a speech delivered during this ses- sion ? Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER .- Yes. Mr. PIRANI .- Mr. Speaker O'Rorke has ruled the opposite. Sir J. G.

WARD .- The member for Welling- ton City (Mr. Fisher) has already read extracts from this same speech. Mr. PIRANI .- Yes ; but I think he was out of order, and that was why I did not object to the Minister for Railways reading the extract. Sir J. G. WARD .- I would just like to point out that the honourable member for Wellington City left out the portion of the Premier's speech in regard to clause 21. It is not fair in political warfare to misrepresent any one. The proper course to take is to state the views fully of your opponent ; and when a member is desirous of scoring against an opponent he has no right, in connection with an important corded views of a man occupying the position of Premier and Minister of Labour. I hold views similar to those stated by the Premier on this point, believing, as I do, that it is essential, if you want to have the industries in this colony carried on successfully, that our legislation should not be of a charactor to create friction in the minds of the workers in the colony, and I have expressed myself to this effect before. I deprecate as much as any member of this House can do anything being done on either side to create a feeling of irritation between employers and employed. I am of opinion that it would have been better to have amended the law in the direction of allowing those who had disputes to settle, before going beyond the Conciliation Boards to the Arbitration Court, to first go to the Conciliation Boards. I enter- tain this opinion for this reason : that I think it is better to conciliate if you can, and with a view to prevent any feeling of irritation be- tween those who are having their disputes tried. I can only hope, as both Houses have thought differently and have decided that unless both agree either side shall have the option of going to the Conciliation Board, but must go straight to the Arbitration Court-I only hope the result of the working of the Act may prove to be beneficial, and I trust that nothing in the shape of what has been suggested by some honourable members may arise-nothing that will tend to promote bad blood between em- ployers and employed. There is no good to be gained by prolonged discussion on the amend-" ments ; the will of both Houses has been put on record by those who thought this the best course to adopt. All we can do is to see that the machinery is well oiled in such a way as to run easily for the benefit of the colony. I am sorry to have heard from the honourable member for Dunedin City (Mr. Millar) any suggestion that, as an outcome of this legislation, there should be an attempt to create an independent labour party in our country. In the interests of those who are suggesting it, it is a course that requires to be carefully thought out before they pledge themselves to it. In the past it has been by co-operation, by the close alliance of both sections of the people who are in the ordinary sense termed Liberals, with the working-classes, that so much good has been done. The result of this co-operation in the past has been conducive to bringing about a great deal of useful and progressive legislation, which has been for the great welfare of our colonists both in town and country ; and before anything is done-although there may be a few odd cases which may lead some to think otherwise-I say it requires to be carefully weighed before such a departure is taken, because, depend upon it, once an attempt is made to create an independent labour party there are bound to arise reprisals. I have given expression to what I think is a very important and difficult matter which may have to be faced, and I am disposed to think that it is the right thing in the interests of the people of the country to endeavour to work together, and in the interests of the country as a whole,

<page:1092>

House should be not to separate or to create independent parties, but to continue to work together in the interests of both, and especially for the general welfare of the colony. My opinion is, if the employers act with that judg- ment and wisdom they should do, they will not allow anything in the shape of feeling to cause them, in the first instance, to go past the Con- ciliation Boards should disputes require to be settled. They will be acting wisely, and to the best interests of the country, if they allow their disputes to go to the Conciliation Boards be- fore pressing them direct to the Arbitration Court. An Hon. MEMBER .- They continue to do that in Dunedin. Sir J. G. WARD .- And I hope they will do it here. If you have a wound, and if it is open at all, I do not believe in rubbing salt in. I be- lieve if we are to have peace upon

the Concilia- tion Board here, and upon Conciliation Boards throughout the colony, we are not acting wisely unless we exercise a little forbearance, because the employers will also see that it is for the well-being of the colony, and therefore for them- selves, that the machinery of the Conciliation Boards should be used before taking disputes to the Arbitration Court. The seriousness of the whole question, so far as the colony is concerned, is very great. We have only to carry our memories back to the terrible consequences which followed the strike we had in New Zea- land in 1890. The result of that trouble re- mained in many families in this country for years ; and I say that a great amount of that trouble reacted against the employés and em- ployers alike, and it left a general desire to create a system for the settling of disputes which would supersede strikes. Sir, we have had such & system, and it has been carried out most successfully by the Conciliation and Arbitration Courts, and it would be ten thousand pities if, owing to the working of the Act by any particu- lar Board in the colony, we were to go back to the old system, which might bring about the disastrous consequences similar to those which existed in the colony previous to the passing of this Act. I do hope that those outside the House, as well as honourable members, who voice public opinion, and who have a consider- able influence in their constituencies and in the colony as a whole, although the legislation placed upon our statute - book as regards clause 21 is against the views of the Govern- ment, will use their influence in a soothing and healing direction, and do nothing to cause strife or heartburnings upon either side, but will, in the interests of the colony as a whole, do their best to have the Act worked without friction, or, at least, with as little as possible. I only make these few remarks because I felt, in the absence of the Premier from the House, it was my duty to say what I felt if he had been here he would have given expression to much more ably than I could possibly have done, and he would certainly have put himself right, as I have endeavoured to do in his absence, in reference to this particular matter of clause 21. I am Sir J. G. Ward of both sides being exercised in a way that will defeat the views of some who look for trouble arising in the future. Mr. G. W. RUSSELL (Riccarton) .- May I correct the honourable gentleman in one re- spect ? He stated that I was one of the mem- bers who charged the Premier with inconsis- tency in connection with clause 21. I did not mention clause 21 in my speech. I made no reference to it whatever. Sir J. G. WARD .- I was not in the House when the honourable gentleman spoke, but I was informed that the honourable gentleman did so. I understood he criticized the Premier adversely ; but, as he says to the contrary, I accept the honourable gentleman's statement that he did not do so. Amendments agreed to. # DEATH OF THE DOWAGER EMPRESS OF GERMANY. A message was received from His Excellency the Governor, forwarding the following let- ters : - "RANFURLY, Governor. "The Governor transmits to the House of Representatives copy of a despatch he has re- ceived from His Imperial Majesty's Consul- General at Sydney, conveying His Majesty's heartfelt thanks to the honourable members of the legislative bodies of New Zealand for the kind sympathy shown on the occasion of the death of the late Empress Frederick. "Government House, Wellington, 1st November, 1901." " Kaiserlich Deutsches General-Konsulat für Australien. "Sydney, 23rd October, 1901. " My LORD,-The resolution passed by both the Houses of the Legislature of your colony, expressing their deep sympathy with His Majesty the Emperor, the Imperial Family. and the German people on the death of Her late Majesty the Empress Frederick, have been duly conveyed to His Majesty. "I have now been instructed by special order to transmit His Majesty's heartfelt thanks to the honourable members of the legislative bodies of New Zealand for the kind sympathy shown on the sad occasion, and I therefore have the honour to request that your Lordship will have the goodness to cause these expressions of thanks to be communicated to the gentlemen named. "I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to your Lordship the assurance of my highest consideration. " P. VON TRURI, His Imperial Majesty's Consul-General. "His Excellency the Right Hon. the Earl of Ranfurly, Governor of the Colony of New Zealand." Sir J. G. WARD (Colonial Secretary) .- 1 move, That these letters be entered on the Journals of the House. Motion agreed to.

<page:1093>
IN COMMITTEE. Clause 4 .- Section twenty-two of the princi- pal Act is hereby repealed, and the following substituted in lieu thereof : - " Immediately upon the coming into opera- tion of this Act in any district as provided in section five hereof, Maori land in such district shall not be alienated by way of lease either to the Crown or to any other person except with the consent of the Council first obtained, and in accordance with the provisions of this Act. In the case of alienation by way of sale where the land belongs to more than two owners, the con- sent of the Governor in Council to such sale shall be first had and obtained ; in the case of alienation by way of sale, lease, or mortgage where the land belongs to not more than two owners, the passing of this Act shall in no way affect the same unless the land is transferred to the Council." Mr. G. J. SMITH (Christchurch City) moved to report progress. The Committee divided. AYES, 15. Rhodes Atkinson Lang Russell, W. R. Lethbridge Fraser, W. Massey Tellers. Hardy Fraser, A. L. D. Monk Herries Pirani Smith, G. J. Hutcheson Kaihau NOES, 38. Palmer Allen, E. G. Fowlds Parata Arnold Graham Pere Barclay Hall Russell, G. W. Hall-Jones Bennet Buddo Seddon Heke Carncross Hogg Stevens Carroll Lawry Symes McGowan Collins Tanner Mackenzie, T. Ward Colvin Mckenzie, R. Willis. Duncan Millar Tellers. Ell Field Fisher Mills Hornsby. O'Meara Flatman Majority against, 23. Motion negatived. Mr. FIELD (Otaki) moved to insert the fol- lowing words after "district": "owned by more than two owners." Amendment agreed to. Mr. KAIHAU (Western Maori District) moved to strike out the word "two" in line 25, with the view of inserting "ten" in lieu thereof. The Committee divided on the question, "That ' two' be retained." AYES, 34. Allen, E. G. Colvin Lawry Arnold Lethbridge Duncan McGowan Atkinson Ell Fisher Mckenzie, R. Barclay Millar Flatman Bennet Mills Buddo Hall Hall-Jones O'Meara Carncross Palmer Heke Carroll Pere Collins Hogg Ward Stevens Hornsby Willis. Tanner. Symes NOES, 11. Field Smith, G. J. Lang Massey Fowlds Tellers. Monk Fraser, A. L. D. Hutcheson Parata Kaihau Herries. Majority for, 23. Amendment negatived. Mr. KAIHAU (Western Maori District) moved to strike out all the words in the section after the word "obtained," down to and including the word "same," with a view to adding a new proviso. The Committee divided on the question, "That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause." AYES, 33. Allen, E. G. Hall Parata Arnold Hall-Jones Pere Heke Smith, G. J. Barclay Bennet Hogg Stevens Buddo Hornsby Symes Carroll Lawry Tanner McGowan Ward Collins McNab Willis. Colvin Millar Tellers. Duncan Carncross Ell Mills Palmer O'Meara. Flatman Guinness NOES, 9. Atkinson Tellers. Lang Herries Field Pirani Seddon. Fowlds Massey. Fraser, A. L. D. PAIR. Against. For. Lethbridge. Mackenzie, T. Majority for, 24. Amendment negatived. The Committee divided on the question, "That the clause as amended stand part of the Bill." AYES, 26. Allen, E. G. Parata Heke Pere Arnold Hogg Seddon Carncross Lawry McGowan Carroll Stevens Duncan McNab Ward Willis. Millar Fowlds Guinness Mills Tellers. Hall O'Meara Colvin Palmer Hall-Jones Symes. NOES, 10. Collins Tellers. Lang Atkinson Field Massey Fraser, A. L. D. Pirani Ell. Smith, G. J. Herries PAIRS. For. Against. Lethbridge. Mackenzie, T. Majority for, 16. Clause agreed to.
<page:1094>
cipal Act is hereby repealed, and the following substituted in lieu thereof : - "The Governor may, after considering any recommendation of the Council, remove and revoke any and all restrictions existing against the alienation of Maori land, whether contained in any Crown grant certificate or other instru- ment of title, or in this Act or any Act hereto- fore passed; and thereafter, but subject in every case to the provisions of ' The Native Land Court Act, 1894,' and the next succeed- ing section hereof, the Maori owners of the lands against the alienation whereof the re- strictions have been so removed and revoked shall have the same rights and privileges to alienate the land as any person other than a Maori and resident in New Zealand possesses in respect of his land : " Provided that nothing in this Act contained shall be construed to authorise the alienation of papakaingas." Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier) moved to strike out, after the words "The Governor may," the words "after considering any recom- mendation of the

Council." The Committee divided on the question, "That the words proposed to be omitted be retained." AYES, 31. Hall-Jones Allen, E. G. Pere Arnold Heke Seddon Atkinson Smith, G. J. Hogg Hornsby Carncross Stevens Carroll Lawry Symes Ward Collins McGowan Willis. Colvin McNab Duncan Millar Tellers. Ell Mills O'Meara Fowlds Palmer Hall Parata Tanner. NOES, 6. Tellers. Fraser, A. L. D. Field Massey Pirani Herries. Lang PAIR. Against. For. Lethbridge. Mackenzie, T. Majority for, 25. Amendment negatived. Words retained. On the motion of Mr. CARROLL (Native Minister), the clause was struck out. Clause 7 .- " Section twenty - eight of the principal Act is hereby repealed, and the following substituted in lieu thereof :- " Any Maori or Maoris, whether incorporated or otherwise, owning Maori land may transfer the same, or any other land, or any definite part thereof, by way of trust to the Council, upon such terms as to leasing, cutting up, managing, improving, and raising money upon the same as may be set forth in writing be- tween the owners and the Council ; and the Council is hereby authorised and empowered to accept such trust : " Provided that, in the case of unincor- all the owners if less than ten, must execute the necessary instrument of transfer, and the whole block so owned, or a definite part thereof, must pass thereby." Mr. CARROLL (Native Minister) moved to insert, after the words " Maori land," the words, "or purchased land "; and to omit the words "or any other land." Amendment agreed to. Mr. FIELD moved to add, after the first word "Council " in line 28, the words: "and as may be approved by Governor in Council." The Committee divided. AYES, 10. Atkinson Massey Tellers. Collins Pirani Field Ell Smith, G. J. Fraser, A. L. D. Tanner. Fowlds NOES, 27. Arnold Parata Lang Barclay Pere Lawry Seddon Carroll McGowan Mckenzie, R. Duncan Stevens McNab Guinness Symes Millar Ward. Hall Hall-Jones Mills Tellers. O'Meara Herries Hornsby Palmer Willis. Hogg Kaihau PAIR. For. Against. Lethbridge Mackenzie, T. Amendment negatived. Mr. CARROLL (Native Minister) moved to insert the following definition, after the words "such trust ": "' Purchased land ' means land which, though owned by a Maori, has been ac- quired in fee-simple by purchase from the Crown, or from any person other than a Maori, but shall not include land acquired by grant from the Crown otherwise than for a monetary consideration." Mr. KAIHAU (Western Maori) moved to add : "if they shall have been authorised in writing by the majority of owners in number and interest in the block," after the words " such owners," in the proviso. Amendment agreed to. Clause as amended agreed to. Clause 8 .- Private dealings. Subsection (1) .- " At any time not later than two months after the first meeting of the Council, any party to such dealing may give to the Council written notice specifying the nature of the dealing, the land to which it relates. the extent to which the dealing is complete, and his desire to wholly complete the same." Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier) moved to omit the words " first meeting of the Council." and insert "the coming into operation of this Act in all statutory districts." Amendment agreed to, and clause as amended agreed to. Clause 9 .- Amendments of principal Act. Subsection (1) .- " As to section three thereof : By repealing paragraph (a) of the definition of
<page:1095>
"'(a.) Land which, though owned by a Maori, has been acquired in fee-simple from the Crown or from any person other than a Maori and for any monetary consideration."" Mr. CARROLL (Native Minister) moved to strike out paragraph (a), and insert in lieu thereof " Purchased land." Amendment agreed to. Subsection (11) .- " As to section twenty-nine thereof : By adding the following subsection :- "'(8.) At the expiration of any lease granted by the Council under subsection two of this section, the Council may, on the request in writing of the owners, transfer back to the owners the land comprised within such lease or any part thereof ; but if the land or any part thereof is subject to any right of renewal, charge, lien, or encumbrance, the Council may decline to entertain any such request."" Mr. KAIHAU (Western Maori) moved, after the words " As to section twenty-nine thereof," in line 52, to add the following words: "By adding the following words at the end of sub- section (1) : ' The Council shall have full power and authority, at the like request of a majority of owners, to set apart any portion of such land as a site for a Native township, and may do or cause to be done all things necessary for survey- ing such site, laying it

off into a township, leasing, and otherwise dealing with the same, in like manner, mutatis mutandis, as Native land is set apart, surveyed, laid off, leased, and otherwise dealt with under 'The Native Townships Act, 1895' ; and "' Amendments agreed to, and clause as amended agreed to. Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier) moved the addition of the following new clause :- "Section three of the principal Act is hereby amended by the addition of the following subsection to the interpretation of ' Maori land ' :- "' (d.) Any land as to which the owner or both owners, if two, or a majority of the owners, if more than two, has or have determined by writing under the hand or hands of such owner or owners that the said land shall re- main subject solely to the provisions of "The Native Land Court Act, 1894," and the amendments thereof ; "' For the purposes of this section " land " means any land in the colony owned or held by Natives, or by Natives and Europeans jointly, under any class of title, and includes any estate, right, or interest therein.' " The Committee divided on the question, "That the clause be read a second time." AYES, 10. Atkinson Massey Tellers. Field Fraser, A. L. D. Pirani Smith, G. J. Herries. Lang Lawry Tanner. Allen, E. G. Hall-Jones Parata Arnold Hogg Seddon Carroll Kaihau Stevens McGowan Collins Ward Colvin Mckenzie, R. Willis. Duncan Millar Tellers. Ell Mills Heke Hall Palmer Hornsby. PAIR. For. Against. Lethbridge. Mackenzie, T. Majority against, 13. Clause rejected. Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier) moved the following new clause :- "Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in 'The Native Land Court Act, 1894,' and its amendments, or in ' The Maori Lands Administration Act, 1900,' and its amendments, the Governor may by Order in Council except from the operation of sec- tion one hundred and seventeen of ' The Native Land Court Act, 1894,' any Native land for the purposes of alienation by lease for a term not exceeding twenty-one years, subject, however, to confirmation as provided in 'The Native Land Court Act, 1894,' and its amendments." The Committee divided on the question, "That the clause be read a second time." AYES, 7. Tellers. Atkinson Massey Field Fraser, A. L. D. Pirani. Lang Herries. NOES, 28. Kaihau Arnold Pere Carroll Lawry Seddon Collins McGowan Symes Colvin Mckenzie, R. Tanner Duncan McNab Ward Ell Millar Willis. Fowlds Mills Hall Tellers. O'Meara Hall-Jones Heke Palmer Hogg Parata Hornsby. PAIR. For. Against. Lethbridge. Mackenzie, T. Majority against, 21. New clause negatived. Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier) moved the following new clause :- "3. Section three of ' The Native Land Laws Amendment Act, 1895,' is hereby amended by omitting the words 'prior to the passing of this Act."" The Committee divided on the question, "That the clause be read a second time." AYES, 5. Field Tellers. Fraser, A. L. D. Lang Herries. Massey.

<page:1096>

Pere Allen, E. G. Hogg Pirani Kaihau Arnold McGowan Seddon Atkinson Smith, G. J. Mckenzie, R. Carroll McNab Collins Symes Millar Tanner Duncan Ward. Fowlds Mills O'Meara Tellers. Guinness Barclay Palmer Hall Ell. Parata Hall-Jones Heke PAIR. Against. For. Mackenzie, T. Lethbridge. Majority against, 25. New clause negatived. Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier) moved the following new clause :- "4. The interpretation of the word ' Maori ' in section three of 'The Maori Lands Adminis- tration Act, 1900,' is hereby amended by omitting the last two words therein, 'by Maoris.' " Clause agreed to. Bill reported. On the question, That the Bill be read a third time, Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier) said, When the measure was in Committee, he stated that whether he was successful in carrying the motions that he had put on the Supplementary Order Paper or not-whether he was successful or not in defeating the Bill introduced by the Government-he would give his reasons for opposing it on the third reading. He thought it was right that he should do so, because he knew that very many members might feel that they had a grievance against him per- sonally for keeping them up all night. He thought, however, that honourable members would agree with him when he said that the only safeguard or prerogative which they had as members of this House was to oppose any measure, and to use any means within their power and within the boundaries of the Stand- ing Orders to show their disapproval of it. He supposed it was natural for members to con- gratulate the Government on putting through Committee these two measures since the

pre- vious evening, but he could not congratulate them upon the method of so doing. He ad- mitted at once that no one was more delighted than himself that the Railways Department Classification Bill had now been launched on a safe sea which would lead it into the haven of the statute-book. That mea- sure was creditable to the Government, but where he said it was discreditable to the Govern- ment was that it had been placed on the Order Paper below the Maori Lands Administration Bill. The object was patent. It was, to keep a quorum of the House to deal with the Native Bill. He ventured to suggest that if the Rail- ways Classification Bill had been taken before the Maori Lands Administration Bill, as certain members wanted it, then the latter Bill would He con- not have passed through Committee. the colony that there was this feeling : that the House was diametrically opposed to the Native legislation of last session. Nothing could sup- port this contention stronger than the feeling of the House, as exemplified on the second read- ing, when it was almost impossible to keep & sufficient number of members present to form a quorum. It was not that honourable gentle- men did not take an interest in the question ; it was that they wished to enter a silent protest against unjust legislation. It was regrettable that the protest was not more pronounced, for the measure was one which affected every member of this House-affecting them directly and indirectly, but indirectly, possibly, more seriously than it affected them directly. He held it was a sacred duty to safeguard the in- terests that were intrusted to them-the in- terests of those who had not had the benefits of civilisation and education such as the pakeha had ; and yet, in 1901, they found the Parlia- ment trying to keep these people down instead of elevating them and assisting them along the path of prosperity. The fact was, legislation was being passed that would be inimical to them and to the colony. He wished to place on record the reasons why he had opposed the Native legislation : Firstly, it was not new legislation or experimental legislation-it had been tried for years and failed ; secondly, he wished to state he had no objection to the Bill at all-all he asked was that the Right Hon. the Premier should for once keep his word. The honourable gentleman had visited every kainga in the North Island when he shadowed forth this proposed legislation-the Native Coun- cil portion. In each of these kaingas he said to the Natives, "I feel, after careful study of the question, that this will be a good measure for you. Let us try it. I am not going to force it upon you. I shall bring down a Bill that shall be permissive in its operations, and if a majority of any of the Natives in a district disapprove of it then it shall not come into operation in that district." That was what the Premier told the Natives-it was his sacred promise to them. And now what did he do? He said, "We will not have anything to do with that. I decline to accept what I stated." And the Native Minister had said, " I do not care what the Premier promised ; I am going to force this through." He (Mr. Fraser) had asked the Premier and the Native Minister privately whether they would adhere to the pledge that had been given to the Natives ; but they would not do so, and in the face of numerous petitions and protestations against this legislation it was to be forced on the un- fortunate Natives; that was, of course, if the Bill was ever workable. Without being egotisti- cal he would ask members to look up Hansard of last year, where he had stated to the House that the Maori legislation would be unwork- able, and that at the end of twelve months it would be found that nothing had been done under it. That was just twelve months and a week ago, and had his prophesy not come true ?
<page:1097>
accrued ? Simply chaos. Now, he would once more be prophetic, and he would say that this day twelve months we would find that nothing had been done under this legisla- tion, but rather that it had been a drag on the wheels of progress of both the Native and European races. There was one clause, 4, which took four hours to discuss. The mem- bers of the House who took a keen interest in analysing that section-not in an antagonistic manner, but to make it workable-spent all this time on it ; but no amendment would be accepted by the Native Minister, and now we found that section as unworkable as it was when brought down twelve months ago. No one knew what it meant. Who had asked for this ? Not the Natives, but those who expected to reap a benefit from it-members like the mem- ber for the Northern

Maori District, who sat through the whole of the work of the Committee, and never opened his mouth once. The honour- able gentleman may have disagreed with other honourable gentlemen who spoke, but he (Mr. Fraser) said that, as a representative of the Maori, it was his duty to show how the measure was a good one. Did we hear a single word from the member for the Eastern Maori District ? That honourable gentleman simply gave a silent vote at the beckoning of the Native Minister. Then, take the member for the Western Maori District, and he felt sorry for that honourable gentleman, who had received some promise from the Government that at present this Act did not operate in his district, and who, inno- cently and child-like, said, "If that is so, I have no further opposition to the measure." In Committee the honourable gentleman was with him in opposing section after section ; but he has now given way to idle promises, and as a result would find himself in a hinaki. A hinaki was an eel-trap, from which, when once in, it was impossible to extricate yourself. The honourable gentleman will realise this when too late. The Native members had not done justice to their constituencies. It seemed strange to him to find Mr. Wi Pere advocating this legislation, because when, thirteen years ago, he advocated a similar measure he was defeated at the polling-booth. And who de- feated him? Our present Native Minister. Had it not been for the Hon. Mr. Carroll's opposition to that Act he would not have been returned to the House in 1887. Speaking from memory, he won the fight by from thirty to forty votes ; but he deserved to win it by three or four thousand, for having opposed that un- just and pernicious legislation introduced by Mr. Ballance. To-day they found the Native Minister and Mr. Pere hand in hand burying their differences and going back to the legisla- Honourable members would tion of 1886. glean that there was something not too savoury or satisfactory or encouraging for them in the near future with regard to Native matters when they found the Native Minister, who, though he might not approve of it or be responsible for it, still advocated such ques- tionable legislation. It made members sus- man acting the part of the chameleon in his change in regard to Native legislation. The Natives had not asked for this legislation ; it was proposed by the Premier to the Natives, who asked them to accept it as an experiment, and, with certain provisoes he had already alluded to, it had been placed on the statute- book. It was only since last session that the Natives had realised this legislation was op- posed to their interests. And when the voice of the Natives had gone forth that they were opposed to it, some consideration should be given to them. He wished to put on record two letters, written by Maoris, with regard to this legislation. Here was was one, signed by a full-blooded Maori, educated at Te Aute Native College, and whose father was a member of Parliament. He said,- " We will have nothing to do with the legisla- tion of the Government in regard to Native lands. We strongly object to free-trade in the sale of Native lands, but do allow us to lease our lands and bear the responsibilities of the European." Then, he had received the following letter, which was published in an Auckland paper, sent to him by Mr. Hone Patene, as follows :-- "SIR,-I wish to draw the attention of the public to the injustice which has been imposed on the Maoris by the passing of the Native Land Act during the last session of Parliament, an injustice which will be so disastrous in its results to us Natives that, could our European fellow - subjects thoroughly realise how disas- trous, they, by force of public opinion, would have it swept from the statute-book, for I feel sure that, if their sense of justice were once aroused, such unfair (to us) legislation would be put a stop to. " According to a legal fiction, there is but one law for both races, yet this Act says that we cannot deal with our lands with the same free- dom as the pakeha. I ask your readers not to mistake my meaning by imagining I am one of the old school, who believed in locking up our lands to European settlement. Far from it. I am well aware that any act of ours attempting to impede the resistless march of civilisation would be the height of folly. " Educated in the best schools in Auckland, thoroughly acquainted with the English lan- guage, and having lived for many years among Europeans, I am fully aware of their power, and of the fact that in our own interests we must abide by their laws, and conform to their cus- toms. "Personally I am in favour of Native lands being taxed under certain conditions, and those conditions I claim are perfectly just and reason- able. Perhaps it

would be more correct to say one condition-viz., put us on the same footing as the pakeha in the mode of dealing with our lands. It is no unreasonable request that I make. " We are as anxious as the Government can possibly be to see our lands profitably settled, a settlement profitable to the present owners and the colony. After having proper reserves
<page:1098>
in the future, let the titles be individualised, Crown grants issued to the various owners ; let them sell in the open market to the best ad- vantage, always subject to restrictions as to the area-according to the quality-that each settler shall hold, thereby preventing that bane of settlement, land monopoly. If the owners are unwilling to sell, let such a tax be imposed as will either compel them to do so or cultivate like any other settler. The vexed question of the ' settlement of Native lands ' will thus be disposed of for ever. "Sweep off all cumbrous Acts from the statute-book, and bring in a simple Bill in the direction I have indicated, and Parliament will vindicate its claim to righteous legislation. " Why should we be compelled to sell or lease our land to the Government alone, for & price that is frequently only a third or a fifth of what private individuals are prepared to give ? "You are the dominant race ; do not abuse your power. Opposition on our part, save by legal means, is hopeless. I therefore appeal to that spirit of fair-play which is pre-eminently the boast of the British people, and call upon you to see that simple justice is done us in this matter. The Government has no power to enter upon and take possession of a European's land without giving him its full market-value. We have an equal right to be put on the same footing, and this right, in the simple spirit of justice, I call upon the public to grant us, since the Government appear unwilling to do so." He would ask honourable members if that was not the multum in parvo of the whole ques- tion, and was it not the strongest argument and denunciation against the Native legislation of the present Government? He (Mr. Fraser) contended that there was in this letter the real feeling of every Native whose opinion was worth knowing in the North Island. He might say, however, that the Native who wrote that letter-a letter which demonstrated his ability - could not lease an acre of his land, nor could he administer it. He could not deal with his lands in any way, but must hand them over to the tender mercies of this Native Council or Board. The Native Minister, or the member for the Northern Maori District (Mr. Heke), or any one of the other Native members, were allowed to vote for legislation of a most im- portant character, and yet they were not allowed to deal with their own land. He had insisted -but there was only a small minority be- hind him - that it should be left to the Natives to decide whether this legislation should affect them or not. Nothing could possibly be fairer. It had been advocated that there should be the referendum. That was no doubt eminently fair in a ques- tion where there was a dispute between the two Houses, and why should there not be a referendum on the Native question? It was monstrous to think that the Natives should be allowed to vote on most important questions affecting the State, and indirectly the Empire, and yet that they should not be allowed to Mr. A. L. D. Fraser ter had introduced an amendment under which it was possible for a majority to say whether any land should be placed under the Adminis- tration Boards and the Council. That should apply all through the Act. He did not think it was necessary he should express regret for having kept members up all night. It had not been pleasant to him. It had been the hardest twelve hours' work he had experienced ; but he would undertake the same task again to break down what he considered a manifest injustice- an injustice that would live. It would be found in the future that a stronger line of demarca- tion had been made between the Natives than had ever existed before. Instead of bringing them in with the rest of the colony in aspira- tion, faith, and sympathy, a barrier was being erected that would keep them further than ever from the rest of the colonists. Mr. CARROLL .- It keeps their land further away. Mr. A. L. D. FRASER said, he supposed no honourable member had had more to do with land transactions than the Native Minister him- self. The Native Minister knew very well that he (Mr. Fraser) had never had anything to do with Maori land transactions in the way of sale. He had never in his life, directly or indirectly. purchased a single acre of

Native land. His work had been on behalf of Natives and Euro- peans in the Courts. He might have been an independent man to-day if he had chosen to take advantage of opportunities that had been thrown in his way. He spoke now as one look. ing through the Native eye, as one who wished the Natives to be protected from the Govern- ment of the day, and, to an extent, protected from themselves. There were occasions when Parliament should step in and help them against themselves, and legislation to meet this could be brought down ; but now they had leris- lation that was going to bring into power & professional Court, with professional Judges and professional hopes of self-benefit. Mr. HERRIES (Bay of Plenty) was 11.30. not going to join in the denunciation of the last honourable gentleman against the Bill. He recognised that an important new departure in Maori legislation had been entered into last session, whether rightly or wrongly time would show, for the Government was re- sponsible. He did not agree with the principle of Maori Councils, but, having got the Act of last session, and found it unworkable as was prophesied, it was their duty to make it mere workable, and all last night he was honestly endeavouring to do that. He did not think this Bill was all it should be as an amending Bill. He believed we would have to amend it next session ; and next session he, at all events. would endeavour, as in this session, to amend it to make it workable. But he did strongis object to this forcing of legislation through by sheer exhaustion. Men well acquainted with Maori matters like the honourable member for Waitemata, who could and would give valuable assistance in this legislation, would not submit to this "jacking " of important legislation
<page:1099>
with the Native race were of supreme importance to the colony, and should have the assistance of all members. He said it was not a credit- able thing that the Government should have to force these measures through. There was no reason why this measure should not have been brought down at an early part of the session, when we had practically nothing to do, and have been calmly and dispassionately discussed for two or three nights. The time would not have been wasted at all on one of the most im- portant aspects of this colony's affairs. Minis- ters ought to recognise it was the endeavour of every member to amend the Bill so as to make it workable, and not to accuse members of stonewalling tactics when any one tried honestly to improve the law. He believed the Bill was an advance in a certain way on the legislation of last session, and he believed the Native Minister would agree that some good amendments were put in last night. But the system of Councils was a faulty one, and he was afraid the principle of the Act would only end in disaster to the Europeans and Natives connected with it. The preamble of the Act of last session, which read almost as a satire on what had happened during the past twelve months, set forth,- " Whereas the chiefs and other leading Maoris of New Zealand, by petition to Her Majesty and to the Parliament of New Zealand, urged that the residue (about five million acres) of the Maori land now remaining in possession of the Maori owners should be reserved for their use and benefit in such wise as to protect them from the risk of being landless : And whereas it is ex- pedient, in the interests of both the Maoris and Europeans of the colony, that provision should be made for the better settlement and utilisa- tion of large areas of Maori land at present lying unoccupied and unproductive, and for the en- couragement and protection of the Maoris in efforts of industry and self-help : And whereas it is necessary also to make provision for the pre- vention, by the better administration of Maori lands of useless and expensive dissensions and litigation, in manner hereinafter set forth." These were fine words, and if the Act and this Bill did half of what was expressed here, he should be only too pleased to support them ; but it did nothing of the kind. Now, what would this Bill bring forth but expensive and dissentious litigation ? Even the keenest lawyers in the colony could not say what clause 22 of the old Bill or clause 4 of this Bill meant. No one could say exactly what the powers of the Council, or of the Maoris who returned them, meant under the Act or its amend- ment of this year, or what power any one had to purchase land or lease it. Then, there was nothing in the Act or Bill to encourage the Maoris in methods of industry and self-help. Nor was there anything in the Act or Bill that prevented the Maoris from selling their land. In fact,

he considered it opened the door wider to the sale of Native land. Clause 22, which was the crux of last session's Act, and clause 4 of this Bill, were read by the free-trade party as supporting their own views. Mr. HEKE .- Clause 29 closes the door to alienation by sale. Mr. HERRIES .- Not necessarily ; and clause 22 actually opened it. He differed from the honourable gentleman, and it only showed how difficult it was for any two parties to agree as to what the Bill did or did not. He con- sidered the Act extended the power of purchas- ing lands, and for that reason he had supported it, because nothing could be worse than the present system. Any change must be for the better. Now the lands were lying idle, and the Maoris were altogether dissatisfied, and the pakeha were dissatisfied because the Act, which was supposed to be the panacea of everything, would not work. He did hope this amending Bill would oil the wheels somewhat, and that these Councils would be found to be a good thing and would carry out the preamble of the Act of last session ; but he very much doubted it. He would impress upon the Minister that it was of the utmost importance to choose the best men to carry out the Act, and he hoped the honourable gentleman had already fixed on the men. He regretted there was no alteration made in the salaries, because he did not think they could get really good men at the low salary being offered. The very best men ob- tainable ought to be got to fill the positions. What he was afraid of was that the salary would be too small, and that probably many undesir- able people would be put into these billets. He hoped the Minister would not be influenced by political feelings in filling up the billets. He earnestly trusted that all party feeling would be removed from this question. He trusted that the amendments made by this Bill would be found to do that which the Minister ex- pected it would do, and, if so, no one would be better pleased to see the Councils have a fair trial than himself. Mr. ATKINSON (Wellington City) said, Al- though he differed very widely from the last speaker on certain important cardinal points in Native land policy, he was in entire agreement with him in his last remarks as to the necessity of getting the best men available for the positions to be filled under this Act, and as to the need on the part of the Minister for caution against anything like introducing or giving way to He thought that all political influence. things, taken together, really pointed to this : that a billet on a Maori Council was almost an ideal post for favouritism and jobbery. He had had brought under his notice a most extra- ordinary example of how, even in the highest stations in the department of the Native Minis- ter, there was favouritism -and perhaps some- thing worse-of a very marked character. The Government purchased either whole or part of the Tamaki Block some time ago, and there fell due recently a sum of £500 to Mrs. Karaitiana in respect of a survey lien. The chief officer of the Native Land Purchase Department, Mr. Sheridan, was consulted on the matter, and he stated that he had the money in hand, and that the only reason he could not
<page:1100>
from the Native Land Court. Mr. Sheridan, in an interview with a clerk of the solicitors retained by Mrs. Karaitiana, suggested that the charging order should be applied for, and he himself drew the application. The application was duly proceeded with, but a few days before the hearing he intimated that there was only one person who could get that charging order, and the gentleman spoken of was not a member of the firm in question. Notwithstanding that, the solicitors proceeded, but Mr. Sheridan in- sisted that it would be no good. However, the order was duly granted about three weeks ago by Judge Mackay. They had since received notice from Judge Mackay that Mr. Sheridan desired to have the matter reopened. The matter was still undecided, but he had here a copy of a letter sent by the solicitors in ques- tion to the Judge's associate as follows :- " Grey Street, Wellington, " Re Tamaki. October 28th, 1901. " DEAR SIR,-We are in receipt of your letter of the 26th instant. We cannot understand the attitude of Mr. Sheridan in this matter. Before the order was applied for, Mr. Sheridan informed us that he had the money in hand, and the only reason he could not pay it out was that he had no charging order from the Native Land Court. "He suggested that the order should be applied for, and he himself drew out the appli- cation. This is in our possession. The appli- cation put in is copied from it. He also telegraphed to the

Chief Surveyor with re- ference to the lost certificate, and got him to compile again the information upon which the certificate was granted. He expressed himself as anxious to pay the money out as soon as he could legally do so. A few days before the hearing, Mr. Sheridan informed us that Mr. A. L. D. Fraser was the only man who would be able to get the order made, and said that he must be employed to apply for the order, or it could not be obtained. He further said there would be no trouble about it if Mr. Fraser was employed. The day before the hearing our clerk saw Mr. Sheridan, and in- formed him that we were going to make the application the next day at Levin, and asked him to send on the certificate of the Chief Surveyor. He then repeated that if we applied the order would not be granted, and that Mr. Fraser was the only man who could get it. "Two days after the order was made Mr. Fraser sent a message to us that he was going to Levin, and that he would apply for the order. When we informed him that the order was already made, he said he was very glad of it, as the people had been kept out of the money for a very long time. " As you are aware, Mr. Fraser was not em- ployed ; but that does not seem to us to con- stitute a valid objection, and Mr. Sheridan has never urged any other. We respectfully submit that any application to be made by him should be made in a formal manner, and that we should have notice of it, and of the grounds of objection. We are taking the Mr. Atkinson understand that Mr. Sheridan has made per- sonal representations. We have sent Mr. Sheridan a copy of this letter .- Yours truly. ". YOUNG AND TRIPE. "A. H. Mackay, Esq., Clerk, Native Land Court, Levin." Honourable members who were familiar with the legal profession in Wellington would know that that was a firm of as good standing as any in the town. He would like to say he had men- tioned to the member for Napier, Mr. A. L. D. Fraser, that he was going to bring the matter up. With regard to the facts in the letter, be would like to say that, although they might be capable of explanation with credit to the honour- able member for Napier, they could not be ex- plained with credit to Mr. Sheridan, the chief officer of the Native Land Purchase Depart- ment. That gentleman suggested a particular course and a form of application, and drew the application up himself. The matter was put on foot and came before the Court, and he then asserted that unless a certain Native agent was employed the matter could not go through. It was monstrous to suggest to a respectable firm of barristers and solicitors that they must brief a Native agent as counsel to put through what, if the officers of the department were doing their duty, was nothing but a matter of course. Such a state of things was nothing short of scandalous, and he would ask the Native Minis- ter to look into the subject and see if it was capable of any creditable explanation; and. further, to direct that in future neither the Chief Clerk in the department nor any under- officer should constitute himself a "tout" for any professional man or any other man in regard to the business that came before him in his capacity as a trustee for the public. When he told the honourable member for Napier he was going to bring the matter up the honourable gentleman said all that Mr. Sheridan wanted him for was to give evidence. But how was that compatible with the desire on the part of Mr. Sheridan, after recommending the application and after it had been granted contrary to his prophecy, to have the matter reopened ? The order was now made, and how was Mr. Sheridan concerned with the evidence on which the Judge had thought fit to grant it ? He would leave tha: to the Native Minister to say. He would like to ask what was to be the future with regard to the administration of the Maori Councils when. under the very nose of the Native Minister and of the Ministry generally, such an obvious piece of favouritism and touting-to call it by no harsher name-could take place as was de- scribed in the letter he had read to the House. This Bill gave us a good deal of trouble last session and this session ; and, being a highly complicated and important matter, the Minis- try thought proper this year, as last, to reserve it until a late period of the session and the early hours of the morning, and, of course, it was impossible to legislate even on ordinary sub- ject-matter, let alone on highly difficult matter like this, under these circumstances. Last year

came out at eight a.m .; this time it has taken from half-past eleven p.m. to seven a.m. He did not think

the honourable member for the Bay of Plenty meant it, but the honourable mem- ber was a little unjust if he included the Na- tive Minister in the suggestion that those who endeavoured to assist the Government in their legislation received nothing but abuse for their pay. Certainly the Native Minister was a model of patience and courtesy during a very trying time in Committee. But the weakness of the honourable gentleman's position was that, first of all, he apparently had no heart for the Bill, and, secondly, hardly seemed to be endowed with sufficient authority to accept amendments even when they approved themselves to his judgment. In regard to clause 4-which was section 22 of the Act of last year slightly altered -it was a positive miracle of bungling on the part of this Chamber and the other Chamber, and continued even by Governor's message, originating with a misprint which we endea- voured to cure by various amendments, which amendments were carried out in an incon- sistent and muddling style. He ventured to say, if this clause went on the statute- book as drafted at present, section 22 of the Act of 1900 would have to take second place as a bungle to section 4 of the Act of 1901. In the alterations there were no less than two contradictions on the face of the clause, one of which we had removed, and the other of which the Minister, although he had admitted it, un- fortunately forgot to rectify until a subsequent amendment had passed. He referred to the fact that provision was made for " alienation by way of sale" where the land belonged to more than two owners, and for " alienation by way of sale and mortgage " where the land belonged to not more than two owners. This dis- tinction, by providing for mortgaging in one case and not in the other, might be deemed to have some restricting effect upon the mortgaging of land belonging to more than two owners, and would, at any rate, be worth inquiring into, and the Minister could, no doubt, have it easily rectified in the Council. His suggestion was that the clause should be wiped out altogether, and the plain, intelligible clause 24 of the Bill of 1900, as it originated there, inserted. The clause, omitting what we unanimously struck out in Committee last session, would then read,- " Maori land shall not be alienated, either to the Crown or to any other person, except with the consent of the Council first obtained, and in accordance with the provisions of this Act." Now, some great authority on the English law described the common law as " a tortuous and ungodly jumble "; but in these ten or twelve lines of clause 4 of this Bill they had surpassed the common law even according to that definition. Clause 24 of the Bill of 1900, if the Minister thought fit to accept it, would be a twofold improvement on the law as it stood at present, apart altogether from this particular Bill. There would be a double pro- tection given to the Natives : there would be an absolute safeguard against alienation of the tional safeguard in the Maori Councils' consent to protect the Natives even against the Crown. Now, the honourable member for the Bay of Plenty was very astute, being certainly one of the best lawyers in the House, and he (Mr. Atkinson) was not at all sure he had not worked a point on the Minister and himself in reference to subclause (9) of clause 9 of the Bill. He asked the Minister to see what would be the effect of that amendment. He only wanted to make sure it was not giving enlarged opportunities for traffic in Native land by dropping subsection (2) of section 26 of the principal Act, as was done by that amendment. The subsection was so inartistic as to appear al- most meaningless ; but at the same time he hoped the Minister would make sure whether the amendment would not incidentally allow free- trade in Native land in a very undesirable way. As a friend of the Bill, he did not want to see the Natives tripped up or deceived by unintention- ally granting them power to part with their freehold without full and sufficient safeguards. No doubt the last provision in the preamble of last year's Act sounded like irony : " Whereas it is necessary to make provision for the pre- vention by the better administration of Maori lands of useless and expensive dissensions and litigation in manner hereinafter set forth." He could not imagine a better hotbed for liti- gation than the Act as amended by the present Bill. If the Act as amended did not remain a dead-letter, he was afraid that it would be likely to prove a curse to the Natives ; but, as a lawyer, he must seek consolation in the fact that it would probably be a gold-mine to the profes- sion. Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier) wished to make a personal explanation. He might state that he had been employed on

behalf of the Karaitiana estate for the last eight years. On behalf of his principals he saw Mr. Sheridan, and asked that, as a matter of expediency, an appli- cation should be sent in for a survey lien. He might explain that he (Mr. A. L. D. Fraser) was the only person who could give evidence which would justify the Government in paying over this money. As to the statement that he was not employed in the case, he might explain that that was not correct. He was both retained and his evidence was necessary in order to sanction the paying-out of the money. Mr. ATKINSON said that, speaking in the honourable member's absence, he had stated that there was no suggestion in the letter of any impropriety on the part of the honour- able gentleman ; but he might add that it had not been suggested to the solicitors engaged that any further evidence was needed for the purpose of getting a charging order from the Native Land Court, and their success in securing the order showed that no such evi- dence was needed. And, as the evidence was solely for the Judge, how was Mr. Sheridan concerned with it, especially now that the order was made? All he had urged upon the solicitors was the retaining of Mr. Fraser pro- fessionally.
<page:1102>
cruel and unreasonable, after the House had been sitting for something like twenty hours, to make anything in the way of a long speech, and he did not intend doing so. Like the pre- vious speaker, the member for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson), he thought it was regrettable that Bills dealing with Native matters should invariably be brought down at the end of the session, when the House was wearied out with long sittings, and when members were ex- hausted in mind and body and not in a posi- tion, physically or mentally, to do justice to the subject. In the present instance he did not think it mattered very much, because, while, like the honourable member for the Bay of Plenty, Mr. Herries, he hoped for the best, he wished to say he considered the Bill was a slight improvement on the existing law. Still, he believed the measure was based on wrong prin- ciples. They could not build a safe and sound edifice on an unsafe and unsound foundation, and that was really what the House was doing in connection with Native - land legislation. They were patching and tinkering with the Native - land laws as they had patched and tinkered with them for years past, and the result would be the same-unsatisfactory to the Europeans and degrading and demoralising to the Natives. While the subject had been under discussion he had been very much amused at thinking of the passage in the Go- vernor's Speech on the first day of the session, in which the country was informed that the Native - land laws, and particularly the Act of last year, were working satisfactorily. What was the actual position ? Here was a Bill that actually provided for somewhere between twenty and thirty amendments in last year's Act ; and, as a matter of fact, not a single acre of Native land had been brought under that Act, and not a single Maori Council was in operation under it. That was what was called & satisfactory state of things. He scarcely knew what "unsatisfactory work " would mean. The Native-land legislation of the pre- sent Government, for some reason or other, had been a complete and absolute failure from first to last. He had been asked what would put it on proper lines. His reply was that the titles should be individualised. The great trouble was that for years past the com- munal system had been perpetuated, while individualisation had not been encouraged. The individualisation of titles would, no doubt, cost money, but it had to be taken in band. Mr. CARROLL .- Compulsorily ? Mr. MASSEY said, Yes, but given a reason- able time ; it could not be done all at once. Every Maori should have his own piece of land, and a sufficient portion of it should be made inalienable, on which he and his family could live, and from which he should be able to make a living. If the Maoris were to be ele- vated they must be made to understand that, while they had all the rights, and privileges, and advantages of British citizenship, they must also accept certain responsibilities. He did not think we could look forward to any instead of thinking of Native-land matters, we should probably be thinking of the elections. and the reception we were likely to receive from the electors. His hope was that the electors, and the North Island electors, to whom the matter was brought home, particu- larly, would take the matter in hand and elect men competent to deal with Native questions, and who

would endeavour to settle them in a businesslike manner that would be satisfac- tory to both Natives and Europeans. Mr. LANG (Waikato) wished to indorse the remarks of the honourable member for Napier in reference to the desirability of bringing the two races together by legislation, instead of widening the breach. His only reason for rising at this time was to explain an error into which the honourable member for Riccar- ton fell in regard to some remarks he made in reference to having one law for European and Maori when speaking on the second reading of the Bill. He had handed the honourable mem- ber for Riccarton his uncorrected Hansard proof, which showed clearly that he had said that he regretted that the system of placing Natives under the same law as Europeans had not been started eight or ten years ago : and he went on to say, if this system had been adopted, in all probability the Natives would by this time be in a position to be treated like other British subjects. He looked upon the Native legislation of the present Government as exceedingly unsatisfactory. They had had to amend the Bill of last session, and next session they would have to amend the Bill of last night, and he did again protest against the manner in which this legislation was forced through the House, and he hoped that next year the matter would be dealt with at av earlier period of the session. Mr. HEKE (Northern Maori) desired to show that this measure had received the support of the majority of the Maori people of this Island. The people represented by Mahuta, of whom Kaihau was the mouthpiece in the House. and also the Native tribes in the Western Maori District, supported the Act of last year. Kaiban himself supported the Bill of last year ; and be would draw the attention of honourable mem- bers to page 175 of Hansard, 1900, Volume 115, where the honourable member made a short speech expressing satisfaction at the Bill. The honourable member also expressed his opinion that his people wanted the Bill. In reference to the Waikato people as a whole, there was a petition presented last year by Henare Kaihat, and signed by Taingakawa and another. In regard to the Natives of the Eastern electorate. a large majority of the tribes had expressed their wish for the Bill being passed into law: and they also accepted the Act of last session. The tribes in the Northern Maori electorate did the same thing. In the Act of last session and in this Bill efforts had been made to as far as possible satisfy that section of the country which desired free-trade in Native lands, and any Native or number of Natives could deal with their lands by sale, lease, or mortgage if
<page:1103>
first, and then, on approval by the Governor in Council, it could take place. In fact, the Go- vernor in Council could act on their own, not- withstanding any objection the Maori Council might make ; and that was really a defect in the Bill, to his mind. By this legislation those Natives who desired to improve their lands could do so, but those who did not wish to improve their lands, but wished to get the benefits from their lands, could transfer them to the Council, and the Council could have them cut up into suitable areas and put up to auction for leasing purposes. Then, on the question of the in. dividualisation of titles, there was nothing to prevent the Natives from doing that now. The member for Napier referred to his (Mr. Heke's) attitude in 1894 in regard to the Native Land Court Bill of that year. His attitude on that occasion, and in regard to all Native legislation, had been in the direction of prohibiting Maori sales, and that the only alienation allowed should be by way of lease. That would be seen from his speeches in the House and from his views expressed in the public Press of the colony. He had also always urged that the Natives should be provided by legislation with means by which they could utilise their own lands His wish was that a system themselves. should be established to satisfy the Europeans who wished to become settlers, and to assist those Maori people who wished to use their own lands and work them themselves. He had always opposed the Crown's right of pre-emp- tion and the sending through the country land agents to purchase Native lands. The Govern- ment had now agreed, however, to cease pur- chasing Native lands, except in cases where the Crown had acquired interests in blocks previous to the passing of the Act of last session. He knew of no instance since the passing of the Act of last year where the Crown had started fresh negotiations in connection with Native lands. That went to show that the Government

were going to see that the Act of last year was tested in a proper way. He might say, in conclusion, that he thought they had in the Act of last year and in the present Bill means by which we could, as far as possible, satisfy pretty well all parties in the country. Mr. T. MACKENZIE (Waihemo) said he gathered from all he had listened to that the time had arrived when they ought to sweep away from the statute-book all Native legis- lation, and begin de novo with a method more up to date, because the Natives were altogether different now from what they were years ago. They were now educated and abreast of the times, and wished to see their land dealt with much as European lands were, with cer- tain restrictions and reservations. He might say, in connection with the Native Office, that it was notorious that only certain individuals and firms could get their work through the Native Land Office. He did not know who was responsible for this. It was infamous and notorious. He might say that he could give the names of those who could get their work whatever, while other firms could not. It was a disgrace to the colony that that should be so. Sir J. G. WARD .- Who are they ? Mr. T. MACKENZIE said he would be pre- pared to give names to the honourable gentle- man. The consequence was that firms who previously enjoyed a wide Native business had lost it, because the Natives knew that they could not get the business through. Mr. MONK (Waitemata) said that what he rose to do was to record the fact that within the last half-hour a very lengthy and eloquent petition had been sent to the House signed by over thirteen hundred Natives praying that this law should not be forced upon them. Honourable members knew how many petitions had been sent to the House against the legisla- tion this House was about to impose upon the Natives in respect of their lands-petitions signed numerously by them, and all pleading that honourable members will withhold from them an enactment that they feel will seriously affect their welfare; and, in addition to that large number, this one has come to the Cham- ber within the last half-hour. It was an eloquent plea for the House to be cautious, and not to impose on the Natives legislation which, it was evident, must be dreaded by a very large number of the Natives themselves, when they went to the trouble to get petitions so nume- rously signed, and so eloquently and strongly pleading that it should not be forced on them. The petition was signed by Natives residing along the East Coast, and he would commend it to the thoughtful consideration of the House. Mr. O'MEARA (Pahiatua) said he had listened attentively to the speeches that had been given, and after having done so he did not think the Act would be complete without the insertion of an amendment in it in the direc- tion suggested in the speech of the honourable member for Waihemo. He therefore moved, That the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of inserting the following clause :- " Notwithstanding anything contained in any Act or regulations, it shall be lawful for any barrister or solicitor of the Supreme Court to appear in any Native Land Court, or Council constituted under ' The Maori Land Adminis- tration Act, 1900,' in the hearing, trial, or consideration of any action, suit, matter, or proceeding." He looked on a clause of the kind as abso- lutely necessary, because, in connection with complicated legislation such as that in the measure, it had been found that even those who were thoroughly versed in Maori customs - the pakeha - Maoris-differed among them- selves as to the interpretation of certain clauses of the Bill. He would like to say that all through the night they had listened to the iteration and the reiteration of the member for Napier-in fact, the honourable member's voice had become absolutely painful to members whose desire it was to improve the Native legislation so that the Native race might be benefited. He was especially glad to support the proposal that lawyers should appear in the

<page:1104>

barristers had trained minds. They had a reputation, and if they committed any indis- cretion they were immediately hauled over the coals by the Law Society. As far as Native agents were concerned, however, they could do as they liked, and for the safety of the lands administration the solicitors of the colony should be enabled to practise in every Council or Court. Notwithstanding the strenuous op- position levelled at the Bill by a few members, the amendments that had been made in it were such as would be

perfectly useless-in fact, they might have been left out of the Bill altogether. He thought members had been unnecessarily taxed in patience and in time by two members who objected to the measure, all of whose efforts had been absolutely futile. Therefore it would have been much better, if this Bill was so obnoxious to the Natives and to these gentlemen as they stated it was-it would have been more to their credit if they had stonewalled it so as not to allow it to be placed on the statute-book at all. He thought the Bill was a good one so far as it went. One or two clauses were probably defective ; but he thought if members of the legal profession were present at the many investigations that took place in the Maori Courts and Councils many of the difficulties that now existed would dis- appear altogether. That was the reason why he moved the amendment. The honourable member for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson) quoted a letter he had received, and which he was allowed to make any use of he deemed proper. He found in this letter the following statement :- " A few days before the hearing Mr. Sheridan informed us that Mr. A. L. D. Fraser was the only man who would be able to get the order made, and said that he must be employed to apply for the order, or it could not be obtained. He further said there would be no trouble about it if Mr. Fraser was employed." What was the meaning of that letter? That one of the most respected and best-known firms of barristers and solicitors in Wellington applied to the Native Court for an order, and the reply they had received was what he had read. He hoped members would agree to the suggestion he had made. Mr. FLATMAN (Geraldine) had much pleasure in seconding the amendment, because he thought it was in the right direction. He trusted the Bill they were now discussing would be passed, in the interests of Natives. He under- stood the Act of last year was unworkable with- out it, and doubtless the House would have done good work when they had passed this Bill, although it had taken many weary hours to do it. He thought it was difficult for those who did not understand Native legislation to ascer- tain whether they were voting right or wrong on these questions. Since he had been in the House he had always desired to support every- thing in the interests of the Native race. It had been said that the South Island members were responsible for so much bad legislation being passed, for the simple reason that they Mr. O'Meara sideration. That charge against the South Island members, made by Mr. Fowlds, mem- ber for Auckland City, was unwarranted, and he might say that such a charge could scarcely have been expected from that honour- able member, who usually talked common- sense. As to the statement of the member for Waitemata, that a huge petition had just been received against this Bill, signed by about thirteen hundred Natives, he might say, from his long experience of petitions, they were of very little value. It would be quite easy to get that number of signatures in a very short time where the Natives resided, by some smart man. In regard to Native legislation, on every occa- sion when a Native Bill had been introduced since he had been a member of the House the Native members were themselves divided on the question, so that it could not be said that the South Island members had voted against the wishes of the Natives as a whole. When the Natives were divided in opinion it was very difficult at times to understand which was the right course to adopt. It was for the Native Minister to guide them on this occasion, and, as he and other Native members had shown that this Bill was necessary, in spite of any petitions that might be sent against it, he thought it was his duty to vote for the third reading. Captain RUSSELL (Hawke's Bay) said the amendment at first sight might appear to be a desirable one, but members must not forget that in former days the Legislature intentionally excluded professional gentlemen from the Court on the ground of the indefinite extension of time of the Court which their presence would bring about. Members ought to consider care- fully before dealing with the point. What had caused him to rise was the somewhat unjust attack made on the honourable member for Na- pier by the member for Pahiatua, who said that members had been unnecessarily kept up during an all-night sitting by two members, and he alluded more particularly to the member for Napier. No one more than himself (Captain Russell) disliked an all-night stonewall, which exhausted men physically and intellectually, and almost invariably achieved no other result; but it was wrong to put blame on the

member for Napier in this instance. The House, he might say, had abrogated its powers and functions. For some years past they had not insisted that the Standing Orders should be observed, or that due time should be given for the consideration of any particular measure. Bills were brought down to the House, and members were not afforded the necessary time to study them-often not even to read them -and, in fact, the House was informed not un- frequently that they must pass them in half an hour. The member for Napier had taken the only course that was open to a member who held the strong convictions which he did in respect to the Native-land legislation. The honourable member was determined that an opportunity should be given to the people of the colony to know that this Bill was being improperly forced on the attention of the

<page:1105>

sideration. To his (Captain Russell's) mind this was a Bill directly adverse to the prin- ciple which honourable members talked about so much - namely, democracy - because it was perpetuating the mana of the chief to the detriment of the tribe, and preventing the subdivision of Maori lands. The Native Minister might dissent from that view, but he challenged the Minister to say that he honestly agreed with this Bill. He might point out also that the member for the Northern Maori Dis- trict had completely changed his views upon the question. A year or two ago there was no stronger advocate for individualisation. But he (Captain Russell) might say that his sole ob- ject in rising was to urge that on this and on many other occasions members should insist on the Standing Orders being observed, and that Bills should not be debated at improper hours and forced through Parliament without time being allowed even for their perusal. Questions affecting the Native race ought to be dealt with not in the dying hours of the session, but particular days, at fixed intervals, through the session, should be specially set aside for their discussion, so that all those who had a know- ledge of or took an interest in Native questions would know when they were coming on for dis- cussion. The present position was that two very important Bills dealing with Maori people had been brought down to the House, referred to the Native Affairs Committee, were not yet reported on, were unread by members ; yet they are told the session was to close in seventy-two hours. Members should insist on business being done properly. It should not be carried through by the brute-force of the majority. It was be- cause the majority used brute-force on all oc- casions that the minority were occasionally forced to retaliate by the brute-force of " stone- walling " as the only method of calling atten- tion to matters in which they were keonly interested. Mr. A. L. D. FRASER (Napier) said the de- bate had to a certain stage been characterized by an entire absence of personalities. The member for Pahiatua, however, had made an attack on him which he (Mr. Fraser) would not reply to. All he would say was that he could stand in his constituency and his past and present career would speak for itself. He would not take up the attitude the member for Pahiatua had descended to-the attitude of making a personal attack on a member of the House. The honourable gentleman blamed him for wasting the time of the House, but, as a matter of fact, the honourable gentleman himself, together with the member for Taieri, had taken up exactly a similar position in re- gard to a measure to which they were opposed. It had since been shown that they were justified in stonewalling as they did ; and, the course he (Mr. Fraser) took last night being on the same lines, the honourable member for Pahiatua should not have objected to it. It was only by taking the course he did that he could show his opposition to this Maori-land legis- lation finding its way to the statute-book. VOL. CXIX .- 69. temata referred to a petition he (Mr. Fraser) re- ceived within the last quarter of an hour. A deputation of Natives waited upon him and asked him to present this petition, which pro- tested in no unmeasured terms against this Bill being brought into operation in their district. It was signed by one thousand four hundred Na- tives, and therefore, as the Native Minister had said he (Mr. Fraser) was simply expressing his own wish and view on this measure, the petition had come in good time, because it was the best defence to that that he supposed he could have. Mr. R. THOMPSON .- What district do they come from ? Mr. A. L. D. FRASER said, from the East

Coast, and they were Natives he had never seen or spoken to in his life before to-day. He thought, if anything could speak in stentorian tones against this measure, which he had fought all through the night, it was this petition. He had fought against the measure because he be- lieved it to be wrong. In regard to the amend- ment of the member for Pahiatua, let him tell the House that permeating through the whole of our Native-land legislation, and the conduct of the business of the Native Affairs Committee with respect to any petition or ques- tion affecting the Native race, was the provision that no party could be represented by counsel or by agent except with permission of the Chairman or Judge of the Native Land Court, and that permission could be withdrawn at any time. The amendment by the honourable mem- ber was going to repeal the whole of our Native Land Acts on that particular question. The honourable member further suggested that only members of the legal profession should be ad- mitted into the Native Land Courts. He was quite willing to vote for that, but he would tell the House that there was a special Bar that was as important and as sacred as the legal profes- sion, and that was the Native Land Court Bar -a Bar formed at a meeting of the Judges in 1890; and no person outside the legal profession could appear before the Native Land Court un- less a license was granted to him year by year by the Chief Judge, if the Chief Judge was satisfied he was a person of good repute, and competent to do the work. He had the honour among a very few to belong to that Bar. The honourable member was now moving to repeal this legislation, and he could not see what benefit the Natives would derive from it. Now, imagine a Native case taken under the legislation of last session or this session. What chance would a Native have of laying his claims before the Native Land Court or Board ? He would have no chance whatever. He said without any hesitation that a Philadelphia lawyer could not evolve light from the chaos of Native-land legislation. The opinion of the Native Land Court Judges, and their judgments, would show the value of the assistance given to the Court by himself and others in deciding intricate ques- tions, and the thanks the Judges had desired to put on record. On account of the involved condition of the cases that came on for hearing now, they required experts who were honourable

<page:1106>

The Native Minister for many years practised in the Native Land Court, and he was one of the most capable men that ever appeared in that Court. Surely the member for Pahiatua did not wish to say that the Native Minister should not continue to act in such a capacity if he so desired. Of course, there had been black sheep in the profession in the past ; but now that the matter was in the hands of the Chief Judge, who had power to grant licenses for ad- mission to that special Bar, he thought they would have no more black sheep in the future. As to the attack of the honourable member for Pahiatua, although that honourable member be- lieved he was attacking him (Mr. Fraser), he was really attacking the Native Department. The honourable member quoted from a letter which put words in Mr. Sheridan's mouth which he (Mr. Fraser) was given to understand he never uttered. He (Mr. Fraser) was not to appear in the case, but was to be a witness. He did not care in the least about any attack upon himself, but he thought it was ungenerous to attack a Government servant who was not there to defend himself. Fortunately, the Native Minister was there to defend him, and, no doubt, when he replied later on, he would do If the honourable member for Pahiatua so. knew all the circumstances he would be the very last to make an attack upon this officer. The whole thing was due to a misapprehension in the letter written by the firm of lawyers re- ferred to, and he hoped the Native Minister would be able to demonstrate to the member for Pahiatua that the statements in the letter were incorrect. Mr. O'MEARA (Pahiatua) desired to make a personal explanation. He might state that the Bill which he had opposed at length on a pre- vious occasion was a private member's Bill, and he thought his action was justifiable on that occasion. Mr. CARNCROSS (Taieri) said that the pre- vious case which had been mentioned where there had been stonewalling was in connection with a private member's Bill ; but in this case it was a Government measure, and the honour- able member had no hope of defeating it, and yet he kept the House up all night. Mr. CARROLL

(Native Minister) thought they had had enough talk about Native legis- lation. He did not propose to answer the arguments that had been brought forward that morning. Everything had been threshed out in the night, and nothing fresh had been brought up in the morning. He was sorry the time of the House had been taken up as it was, but only a few members had carried things on, and on those few members must rest the responsibility for what had been done. He was sorry the honourable member for Napier had taken the course he did. That honourable gentleman, he thought, might amend his conduct in the House, and not say sharp things to honourable members-remarks that were unprovoked. It might be clever or witty, but the honourable gentleman should remember that other mem- bers had feelings as well as himself, and he Mr. A. L. D. Fraser bers bore up well against some of the honour- able gentleman's sharp witticisms-at any rate, much better than the honourable member him- self would stand a return of the compliment. He (Mr. Carroll) regretted that motives had been imputed. It was a line of conduct that should not be pursued unless there were facts upon which to base the imputations. The honourable member for Napier had said that those who were supporting the measure were office-seekers. He did not give them the credit of acting with a patriotic desire to serve their race. He claimed for himself that he was the pure article, and others, who held different views, were impure. He said the whole object of the Bill was to build up a professional Court in which the supporters of the measure could practise. That was quite wrong. He (Mr. Carroll) thought if the history of the Court as at present constituted was looked into it might not bear too close an inspection ; but was that an argument in opposition to the measure ? No, it was not. On the contrary, it was a very good reason why the present measure should have a fair trial. He would like to say in the honourable member's favour that, so far as he had known him, he had always been upright, and it was to be regretted that he had taken the stand he did, and had wasted the time of the House. The honourable gentleman - he referred to the member for Napier-was hasty and hysterical, and allowed himself to be drawn into paroxysms, so that he was not always responsible for what he said. The honourable member for Hawke's Bay attempted to justify the stonewalling of last night, and said the honourable member for Napier was making a noble stand to prolong time and give the country an opportunity of understanding what the Bill was, and what the honourable member's views were. Captain RUSSELL .- To give the country an opportunity of knowing both sides of the ques- tion. We were not allowed to discuss the other. Mr. CARROLL said that the honourable member for Hawke's Bay was a great stickler for propriety-at least, they might so assume from his many attempts to urge this point against the Right Hon. the Premier. Yet here they found him, fresh after a good night's sleep, attempting to justify, in his usual lofty and suave manner, the stonewall of the honour- able member for Napier, and condemning the action practically of the whole House, which resisted throughout a long night the efforts of one member to obstruct a Bill desired by Europeans and Maoris alike. The honourable member for Napier had already filled the news- papers with his views on the Native question. and declaimed against the Government far and wide. Now, in reply to the honourable mem- ber for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson), in the matter which he brought up in connection with Mr. Sheridan, of the Native Department, be could only say that from his knowledge of that officer, ranging over a course of many years, in which he had held a high and responsible position in the Government, he

<page:1107>

him, or any one associated with him in the business of the department accuse him of wrongdoing. In his own opinion, Mr. Sheridan was an estimable and excellent officer, and no one carried the confidence of the Government more than he did. But that did not get away from the position sought to be established by the charge. He was glad the honourable gentle- man had brought this matter up, because now, as he was in the position of Native Minister, he should hear any accusation that was made against any officer under his control. It was the duty of the Minister to see that the depart- ment over which he presided was pure, and working honestly in the public interests. He thought it was only fair to all parties concerned if the

honourable member for Waihemo, and the honourable member for Wellington City, and the honourable member for Pahiatua tendered to him the information in their pos- session upon which the reflections were cast upon the officer under mention, and he would make inquiries ; and if as a result of those in- quiries anything was discovered by him to justify what had been said, then there was only one course open for him to take-that officer had to go. He was not going to have any one in his department guilty of dishonourable conduct. On the other hand, it was his place to protect the officers of his department from the reck- less charges that were made by members, and he challenged them to give proof in sup- port of their statements. Now, in regard to the petition of thirteen hundred Natives of the East Coast presented by the honourable member for Napier, he might state that it only came before this Parliament within the last three weeks, although specially paid can- vassers had been at work ever since the Act passed last year on the East Coast from Gis- borne to the Bay of Plenty getting signatures, and yet they could only get thirteen hundred. In his part of the district alone he undertook to say he could get a petition signed by thirteen thousand Natives in favour of the Bill, and without paying any one to go round and obtain their signatures. They could judge, therefore, the value that should be placed on the petition which the honourable member for Napier made so much of. He would now refer to a matter that was brought up in Committee by the honourable member for Bruce with regard to a certain block of land. He said that application had been made for the removal of restrictions on that land, that £30 an acre was offered by a private individual for the land, but that the Government refused to remove the restrictions and to permit the sale ; and that the Government afterwards removed the restrictions so that it could buy the land at £7 or £9 an acre. The honourable member could not give the name of the block or the particular locality, but he (Mr. Carroll) had made inquiries, and had placed his finger on the spot. The block was the Kai-iwi Block. He was informed by the department that the land was very valuable, but was under lease to a European. The lessee had had that land for lease at totally inadequate rentals. Out of 12,500 acres the Government had bought only 500 acres from the Natives, which they in- tended to cut up for a township. The Govern- ment had had two valuations made of the 500 acres, one by a Government surveyor and the other by the Hon. G. F. Richardson, formerly Minister of Lands. The valuations were £9 17s. and £11 respectively per acre, and about £12 was what it had cost the Government, includ- ing compensation to the lessee. It would have, in fact, paid the Natives-the original owners -to have given that 500 acres to the Govern- ment for nothing, because of the value, by cutting it up into a township, it would add to the 12,000 acres that remained to them. That was the only instance men- tioned by the honourable member to show how dishonest the Government had been in their dealing with Native lands, and the facts just recited by him (Mr. Carroll) showed how groundless were the assertions of the honour- able member. As a matter of fact, the Govern- ment had never been "in it " with the private speculator in open dealings. Whatever dif- ference there might be between the price paid by the Government and that paid by private dealers, it was quite certain that the Govern- ment did not have the best of the comparison. Private dealers picked out the best of the land, while the Government bought good and bad equally. With regard to the Bill, and the pre- dictions made by some honourable members as to its failure, those predictions might come to be true ; but he would ask members to judge by results-to allow, say, two years or more to elapse, and then ask for a return to be laid on the table as to the results of the administra- tion of the Act. He trusted the honourable member opposite would not be a good prophet on this occasion. He (Mr. Carroll) was as anxious as any one that good results should follow this legislation. If there were weak spots in it, surely it was the duty of all to com- bine and strengthen those weak spots, and make the legislation so that the country would reap the advantage. He might say, in respect to the member for Waitemata, that that honour-, able member had never yet understood the practical form of dealing with the Native ques- tion. Sentimentally and on the higher flights no one could vie with the honourable gentleman ; up in the clouds no one could follow him : but when he came down to the bed-rock, and

faced the question of dealing with Native land in a practical way, and making the same profitable and of utility to the owners and of advantage to the country, the honourable gentleman was entirely out of it. He (Mr. Carroll) would not go to the honourable gentleman for a policy. If ever he was compelled to go to the Opposition benches for assistance in framing good, sound, practical Native legislation he would go to the member for the Bay of Plenty and the member for Franklin, and, as Attorney-General, to the member for Wellington City (Mr. Atkinson). Of course, he was not forgetting the member for Palmerston, who was a very valuable member

<page:1108>

always in the humour. He (Mr. Carroll) would, however, prefer to trust to members of his own party rather than the honourable gentlemen opposite. Mr. HERRIES (Bay of Plenty) wished to make a personal explanation. The Minister had spoken about stonewalling, and alluded to a certain few members who took part in the debate on the previous night. He (Mr. Herries) was one of the members who took part in the debate in Committee, but he could assure the House that there was no stonewalling as far as he was concerned. Mr. CARROLL .- I was not referring to the honourable member. Mr. HERRIE'S said he wished to put that on record, because he would not like his consti- tuents to think that he was stonewalling on Probably there were more this occasion. Maoris in his electoral district than there were in the district of any other member, and therefore it was naturally his desire that good legislation should be passed. That involved on his part, of course, closely watching the passage of these measures, and he wished more members in the House took a keener interest in Native- land legislation. He might say that he and others had simply endeavoured to put this Bill into as workable a shape as possible. Mr. PIRANI (Palmerston) always liked to ac- knowledge a compliment. At the same time he liked it all the better if it were sincere. The Native Minister named four members from the Opposition side of the House whom he said he would like to choose to advise him in regard to Native affairs. But would the House believe that the honourable gentleman had not put one of those members on the Native Affairs Committee, the composition of which he was responsible for ? That being the case, the House would agree that the compliment was an empty one. Notwithstanding that, the Minister was, no doubt, speaking the truth. What he said was what he ought to do, and if the next Native Bill he brought up was scanned by an advisory committee of the four members named, together with the Minister himself, it would be sure to be a good measure. So far as he was con- cerned, he was always in a good humour when the business under consideration was in the public interest as well as in the interests of those it was desirable to benefit. Amendment negatived, and Bill read a third time. # GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS DEPART- MENT CLASSIFICATION BILL. IN COMMITTEE. Clause 19 .- Procedure as to appeals. The Committee divided on Mr. Guinness's new subsection. AYES, 13. Tanner. Fowlds Atkinson Herries Barclay Tellers. Lang Collins Guinness Ell Massey Pirani. Field Symes Mr. Carroll O'Meara Allen, E. G. Hogg Palmer Hornsby Carroll Pere Colvin Kaihau Seddon McGowan Duncan Fraser, A. L. D. Mckenzie, R. Ward. Tellers. McNab Hall Arnold Millar Hall-Jones Smith, G. J. Heke Mills Majority against, 10. New subsection negatived. Mr. GUINNESS (Grey) moved the fol- lowing new subsection :- " At the hearing of appeals the evidence shall be confined to the charge brought against the appellant." The Committee divided. AYES, 13. Tanner. Herries Atkinson Collins Lang Tellers. Ell Lawry Field Barclay Massey Pirani. Guinness Symes NOES, 20. · Pere Allen, E. G. Kaihau Seddon McGowan Carroll Smith, G. J. Millar Colvin Ward. Duncan Mills Tellers. Fraser, A. L. D. O'Meara Arnold Palmer Hall Mckenzie, R. Hall-Jones Parata Majority against, 7. Amendment negatived, and clause agreed to. Clause 13 .- " For the purpose of the depart- ment an Appeal Board is hereby constituted for the North Island and the Middle Island respec- tively, each of which Boards (hereinafter called ' the Board ') shall consist of the following persons, that is to say,- "(1.) A Judge of the District Court, or & Stipendiary Magistrate, to be ap- pointed from time to time by the Governor, and to be the Chairman of the Board ; "(2.) One person to be elected by the mem- bers of the First Division in the

North Island and Middle Island re- spectively from among their num- ber ; and "(3.) One person to be elected by the mem- bers of the Second Division in the aforesaid Islands respectively from among their number." Sir J. G. WARD (Minister for Railways) moved that subsection (3) be struck out, and the following inserted :- " (3.) One person to be elected from among their number by members of each of the following departments in each of the aforesaid Islands-that is to say, the Workshop Depart- ment, the Locomotive Running Department, the Traffic Department, and the Maintenance Department ; but only the person elected by the department in which the appellant is em- ployed shall act on the Board." Amendment agreed to, and clause as amended agreed to.
<page:1109>
On the question, That the Bill be read a third time, Mr. FISHER (Wellington City) said he wished to congratulate the Minister for Rail- ways on the passing of the Bill. He and the member for Wellington Suburbs, Mr. Wilford, who was the most competent guardian of the interests of the railway employés in this dis- trict, in their efforts to aid the honourable gentleman, abstained from taking any part in the discussion of the Bill in Committee. They wished the Bill to pass, and that was the best way to help it. They recognised that the Bill was a perfect whole, and that it would be indis- creet to interfere in any way with its symme- trical proportions. Accepting that suggestion from the Minister for Railways, he (Mr. Fisher) and the honourable member for Wellington Suburbs moved no amendments, although they had many prepared. The Bill having reached its present stage, the persons most concerned- the railway employés of the colony-would, he hoped, understand that in the desire to save time, the House having reached such a state of high pressure, nothing was to be gained by prolongation or further discussion. He thought the House would agree with him in saying that no Bill submitted to Parliament during the present session had received so much thorough consideration at the hands of any Minister or the House. Members most in- terested in the passing of the Bill had spared no effort to aid the Hon. the Minister for Railways, who was entitled to great credit for passing such a difficult and important Bill, in- volving interests to the railway servants which it would be hard to measure. He knew the Bill would not give satisfaction to everybody. No Bill ever did. But no Minister had ever tried to give greater satisfaction, nor had any House ever given a Minister such united and unanimous support. He could only congratu- late the honourable gentleman, and say that the members of this district, in common with other members who had taken a great interest in the matter, were in a position, on behalf of the rail- way servants of the colony, to offer congratula- tions to the Hon. the Minister for Railways. Sir J. G. WARD (Minister for Railways) thanked the honourable member for his kind remarks. He had done his best with a most difficult matter to make it as effective as possible for the Railway service as a whole, and if he had succeeded he was quite satisfied. He desired also to thank those honourable gentle- men who, by the way in which they had allowed him to proceed with this Bill, had given more valuable assistance than if they had talked a great deal upon it. Self-denial in the way of criticism to a very large extent was the best way of assisting in getting such a technical measure, bristling as it was with difficulties, through the House. He desired to say that in one point in Committee he made an alteration in the Bill which he believed would very materially benefit the railway employés of the colony. That alteration was made in the composition of the right that the honourable member for Wel- lington Suburbs, who, in the course of his remarks on the second reading, referred to the I matter, and had been told that he (Sir J. G. Ward) would give it consideration, should know that he had done so, although the alteration was, perhaps, not quite as the honourable gentleman suggested. He had gone a little further in the matter. He had been exercis- ing his mind about the constitution of the Appeal Board for some time, and he thought what he had asked the House to do was a step in the right direction. The alteration made in the Appeal Board was as follows: In addi- tion to a Judge of a District Court or a Sti- pendiary Magistrate to be the Chairman of the Board, and one person elected by members of the First Division of the North Island and Middle Island respectively, there was

also now the right given under the Bill for the Workshops Branch, the Locomotive Running Branch, and the Maintenance Branch each to elect one of their number to be a member of the Appeal Board ; but only the person elected by the re- spective branches he had just named would be entitled to sit on the Board when a case affect- ing any one in his special branch was before it. That gave employés of the different depart- ments an opportunity of having one of them- selves on the Appeal Board ; and he believed the work of the Appeal Board of the Railway service would be more useful in the future, and there would be certainly more confidence in it by the different branches affected than there had been in the past, though the Appeal Board had done excellent work, and no reflection in any way was intended upon it by the alteration he had made. He thought, on the whole, the Bill would confer great benefits on the railway em- ployes, and he would not further trespass upon the time of the House, and he had much plea- sure in moving its third reading. Bill read a third time. The House adjourned at thirteen minutes to one o'clock p.m. (Saturday).