

or until the workmen took part in the general strike. Of course one of the conditions of working was that the company should supply no coal to the Union Steamship Company.

824. This was an additional element in the compromise?—Yes.

825. On what date was that?—On the 30th August I sent a letter to the manager asking him not to do so.

826. When was it accepted by the company?—3rd September. The following is the letter of the 30th August :—

Mr. James Bishop, Mine-manager.—DEAR SIR,—Please understand that one of the conditions of the settlement is that the coal mined shall be carried by vessels manned by union sailors, the miners declining to fill coal directly or indirectly for the Union Shipping Company, or any other company employing blackleg labour. We understand from your letter to-day there is no misunderstanding on this point. If your company should determine on any other course we shall be obliged if informed so at once.—S. ANDREW, Secretary.

827. When did the company first get notice that they were not to carry coal?—This was the first intimation the manager received from us.

828. How did he come to write any letter at all—because in your letter you seem to refer to one received from the manager?—I do not recollect that he received any direct intimation that the coal was not to be supplied to the Union Company. I do not know how he got the intimation.

829. Was this question not definitely considered at the time of the ballot?—No. Although it was not mentioned, there was a tacit understanding.

830. Between whom?—The men themselves, and, I have no doubt, the company.

831. When was that understanding arrived at?—On the 3rd September we received the letter. On the 28th August a ballot was taken, and the matter was there decided without any direct question having been raised as to whom the coal should be filled for, yet with the complete knowledge of all hands of the affiliation existing between the sailors' union and the coal-miners, who were part of the Maritime Council. Under these circumstances it was known at once that they would not take the part of the company.

832. When did the miners join the Maritime Council?—I cannot give the exact date, but perhaps it was a year and a half ago.

833. Did your joining with the Maritime Council necessitate your taking up the position indicated in your letter?—Yes, I should say so, on that account.

834. How does that necessity arise? Is it in any rules, or how is it expressed?—The affiliation of the unions is made up in this way—in fact, I think I can give you the rule relating to it from memory: "That the Maritime Council is made up of delegates representing various maritime bodies, which are pledged to support each other in time of trouble."

835. Are the miners considered a part of the Maritime Council for this purpose?—Yes.

836. By "support" is it meant that they are to give assistance in case of any suspension of wages?—Yes.

837. And did it mean anything beyond that?—It meant, of course, any movement that would support any other union.

838. You say the miners are required to take up this position: is it because of the rule you have just quoted?—Yes. Of course, if the miners here fill coal for the Union Company and enable them to go on with their trade as usual, that would be helping the other side.

839. *Mr. Brown.*] I understand by this that the miners are pledged to take up the business of the Maritime Council?—Yes.

840. Have you any phrase in your rules representing "boycotting"?—There is a rule in our rules that requires us not to work with non-unionists. I hardly know what you mean by boycotting in this case.

841. Do you mean rules adopted by the association of miners?—Yes.

842. That was the real cause of the present strike?—Yes.

843. That was the real cause of the letter of the 30th August, I understand?—Yes.

844. Has the manager of the mine ever seen your rules?—I think he has.

845. Has there been any special recognition by the company of these rules?—During the last two years the company has fully recognised them.

846. Were they consenting parties to them, so that the labour, if employed, was to be pledged to these rules?—Yes, I think so; but the conditions are such that the company would do away with them altogether. The acceptance of the unions is, however, with the majority of the men. It is the will of the men to form a union. I do not know if the rules have been submitted to the company for approval. This union has been in existence for the last five years—that is, the Brunner local union.

847. With the same rules?—The rules are slightly altered from time to time.

848. *The Chairman.*] What was the effect of the affiliation? Do you think it was necessary? Could the union have effected its purpose during its period of existence without affiliation?—No. I think it is impossible for a local union to fulfil its purpose alone; affiliation is necessary.

849. That is why you affiliated with the Maritime Council?—Yes. Employers are affiliated, and of course the workmen must necessarily do the same to protect themselves.

850. Were the employers affiliated two years ago? Was that a cause?—I will say this in explanation: that the affiliation takes place to enable unions to have increased strength. I said there, and I still mean, that it is necessary. I do not mean that it is a consequence of the affiliation of the companies, though I believe the Union Company as far back as 1884 or 1885 joined the Australian Company of Shipowners, and the unions in New Zealand were not so early as that, so that the affiliation of employers did precede the affiliation of the workmen.

851. Do you know that from your own knowledge?—No, not from my own knowledge, but I believe it to be so. I say this on the authority of a letter by Sir Robert Stout, in the *Otago Daily Times*.