

victory on either side. My opinion of the capitalists generally, and my experience and knowledge of human nature, is that if the capitalists had complete victory there would be a tendency to tyranny, and if the labour side had complete victory there would be a tendency to insubordination and cheek. I consider that if the strike is ever concluded properly it must be upon a give-and-take principle."

3147. Does "give-and-take" mean getting all the profits that are made out of a concern?—No; but there should be a little yielding on the points of difference on each side.

3148. But there is no point of difference in connection with the strike?—No; but if there is a union I think one party, if he has not a just cause himself of complaint, must support the party that has, and be loyal to the union.

3149. Does not that involve similar tactics on the part of the employers?—Yes, probably.

3150. And then you are just where you started from. You consider affiliation between the unions to be a right thing?—Not entirely. My own opinion is that the officers should never affiliate with the seamen. I hold that to be an evil. I contend that the working-classes are undoubtedly a class of people not educated yet, at all events, so as to know their place; and I hold that an employer has a right to be, and must be, considered as master. I always contend—and there is where I differ with the maritime view of affiliation—that a ship at sea is a little world of itself, and if the officers are affiliated with the seamen in some union there is a danger of the working-classes being insubordinate and turning round impudently and giving cheek to an officer.

3151. Then, do you think that coal-miners are sufficiently well informed to know the rights and interests of bricklayers, bootmakers, and others?—Well, no.

3152. Nor are bakers and others sufficiently interested to know miners' interests?—No.

3153. Then, is this affiliation between trades of such different interests wise or advisable?—No. Almost the only affiliation that I agree with is that of the wharf-labourers, miners, and seamen, because their work is so identical. I consider that an affiliation in their case is useful.

3154. Now let us come to the present position. Are you aware of the date when the men recently went to work?—I do not know, but I should think it would be just before the date of this present strike.

3155. We have been informed that they continued work for three weeks—say, up to the 21st September?—I know they went to work, and the coal was coming down again.

3156. And then the "Brunner" arrived?—Of course, when the strike took place the miners forbade the coals being given to the Union Steamship Company's boats.

3157. Do you think that the miners, being paid for the mining of the coal, should control the destination of it?—There was an agreement with the mine-manager and Mr. Kennedy that the coal should not be supplied to the Union Steamship Company's boats during the struggle.

3158. Do you think that the men who mine the coal for the company should control what the company does with that coal as a matter of business? Could the commerce of the world be carried on, do you think, if that principle were admitted?—I admit that on the side of the company it was a very stupid agreement for them to enter into.

3159. Are you aware that the "Brunner" was here because the seamen's strike with the Union Steamship Company was virtually over?—I cannot say that it is over yet.

3160. You cannot?—No.

3161. What constitutes the end of a strike?—That is rather a difficult question to answer.

3162. Is it a true principle, as stated by a leader in Australia, that when the men's places are filled up the strike is over?—No. Every sensible man must admit that while there is only something in the shape of a man in a position you cannot call it being filled up.

3163. If the men work the boats, a mine, or any other thing efficiently, to the satisfaction of their employers, are not the positions filled up?—I, for one, from experience and positive proof, will never admit yet that it is worked to the satisfaction of the employers.

3164. Your reply, then, leads to this: that the employes constitute themselves a body who judge of the efficiency of the seamen running the Union Company's boats on the 22nd September and now?—I myself consider that any man, whether he is a seaman, a labourer, or a miner, can judge, as a rule, to a certain extent, as to whether a man is a seaman or is calculated to act as a seaman.

3165. And because the Union boats are not manned by what the miners consider seamen they refuse to supply them with coal?—Not totally on that ground. They refused to supply them with coal because of the strike then going on, not because of the bad seamen on board. I was driven into that corner because I thought on the 22nd September, when the "Brunner" arrived, and the places of the seamen being filled up, the strike was over.

3166. If you were driven into that position, it is not over yet. The boats are running?—Yes; but they are manned in a most unsatisfactory state.

3167. Are the miners called upon to judge as to the ability of the seamen?—I have heard the murmuring of the officers, for instance, in the "Brunner." You would admit that it is not an officer's place to mount the rigging, or go up and regulate the gear for the taking-out of the cargo. An English officer would not dare do it; he would not think of doing it. I have been to sea, and I know an officer's position.

3168. Our object is to get at the exact sentiments which should guide these things?—If an officer goes out of his place to do what is a common seaman's duty, undoubtedly it might be said that is unsatisfactory. I will give you a particular instance of the difference between the wharf being manned by "free" labour and unionist labour. At the time you refer to, when the "Brunner" came here she had sixteen seamen on board, termed "free" labourers, and about 600 tons of cargo. The "Lawrence" came here with 450 tons of cargo, and a union crew of six men—being, in fact, manned by a union crew. Our lumpers went to discharge her, and I noticed this particularly and called the Press on the wharf to note it also: that there was a considerable difference