

852. You mentioned that the Grey Valley Coal-miners' Association had rules?—Yes; I produce a copy. [Exhibit No. —.]

853. You mentioned that among the rules was a rule against members of the Association working with non-unionists?—I do not think this copy of the rules includes that.

854. When was it passed?—Probably about twelve months since. That is as near as I can say now.

855. Do you remember the wording of it at all?—It said the men were not to work with non-unionists.

856. Did it refer only to the men employed in the mines?—Yes, in the case of these local rules.

857. Then you have told us that there was a tacit understanding between the miners and the coal company that they were not to load coal on the Union Steamship Company's ships. How did the rules come to apply to the Union Company's ships? Were they included in your rules?—No; not in these local rules.

858. Well, then, how could it be said that the miners under the Association were in any sense working alongside non-union men on board the Union Steamship Company's steamers?—Because the Brunner miners are a branch of the Amalgamated Miners' and Labourers' Association.

859. What is this new association? Have they a rule to that effect?—Yes.

860. When did you join this Amalgamated Miners' and Labourers' Association?—That was formed in December last.

861. Is mining coal and loading trucks a matter of working alongside non-unionists on board the steamers according to any rules?—Yes.

862. Is there any rule the wording of which would prevent miners from loading coal for non-unionist bodies?—That is only an exchange of term. The sailors' union became involved in a dispute with their company—the Union Steamship Company—and non-union men are placed on board their ships.

863. I want to trace this rule to its origin. Is it one of the rules of the Amalgamated Miners' and Labourers' Association that their members are not to work with non-unionists?—Yes.

864. How is it worded? Does it mean in your own particular industry or trade?—Yes; on the industries represented in that association.

865. I mean that, supposing now that there was some body of men bringing timber to the mine, or any case of that kind, not having formed a union amongst themselves, and not being affiliated or in unity with any other body of workmen?—We would not take any objection to their joining in the affiliation. Then the rule still applies that we must not work with non-unionists when unionists were available for that employment.

866. But if unionists were not available for that employment?—In that case, of course, we would work.

867. If unionists were not available for running the Union Company's boats and they were compelled to employ free labour, would you then be debarred from loading those boats?—Yes.

868. Did you become subject to a more general rule at a later date?—Before this last body was formed there was in existence a body called the Delegates' Council. This was confined to the Coast. Then the Amalgamated Miners' and Labourers' Association came into existence and took the place of that body, and of course it has now bodies outside of the Coast connected with it.

869. Were the miners fully aware when they joined this affiliation of unions they might be required to strike for matters that did not affect their work? Were they individually made aware of that?—We understand that any matter that affects one body of labourers affects the whole, if it is in the direction of an attempt to break down unionism. We cannot understand any disconnection. In a strike, for instance, of one body, all the other bodies must join in maintaining their position.

870. Is it necessary they must strike in order to embarrass the employers who are in controversy with their men?—Yes.

871. I will put it in another way. Referring to that strike that took place at the end of August, was that the first strike that has taken place within the last two years?—We do not call that a strike. We call that a lock-out, because the men were quite willing to continue working if the company were willing to continue paying the usual wages. There was no strike at all: the company closed the mine.

872. *Mr. Moody.*] That was the time the 20 per cent. was brought in?—Yes.

873. *The Chairman.*] Well, there was a strike in September?—Yes.

874. Was that the first time the men refused to work?—That is the first strike that has affected the three mines.

875. That is the strike upon which they are now out?—Yes.

876. What is the difference between a strike and a lock-out?—In the former the men seek to impose terms that are unfavourable to the company, and in the latter the company seek to impose terms unfavourable to the men.

877. You spoke about the strike of the 22nd September: did your men strike?—Yes; because they came out in support of the affiliated bodies.

878. We have left out one stage. What was the date of the company giving in to the demands of the men for payment of 2s. 10d. per ton on the whole coal?—I think, in March, 1890. In all the mines the men requested payment by gross weight.

879. And was that granted at once?—That was granted without any stoppage.

880. *Mr. Moody.*] That was the 2s. 10d. granted for gross weight?—Yes; for solid working and for pillars in Wallsend and Coal-pit Heath Mines, and 2s. 6d. per ton for Brunner pillars.

881. *The Chairman.*] Had any previous attempt ever been made to have payment by the gross weight?—Yes; but that was before I took any official position in the union.

882. Do you remember what the result was in that case?—As regards the Brunner Mine there