

shown: adults, 569; apprentices, 366. The average was 1.65 adults. The figures given in the returns were those referring to workmen who have reached their twenty-first birthday. He considered that there was a great deal of selfishness with regard to the proportion of apprentices. There was no doubt that the only reason for urging it was not in the interests of the young people of New Zealand, nor the interests of the Colony of New Zealand, but that the members of the union think there will be more work for them at a higher rate of wages. There were many subjects on which he should like to have touched, but he hoped that the other gentlemen who would be speaking later on would bring up any subject he had omitted.

Mr. Anderson (for Messrs. Anderson and Sons) said he would like the Board to take into consideration the wages of the Old Country. How could the union expect employers to pay 10 per cent. advance on men receiving over 9s. per day? He considered that the clause where it states "Young journeymen having served their apprenticeship shall be allowed to work for 1s. per day less than the above rates, until attaining the age of twenty-three years, in the shop in which they have served their time, but shall then (at twenty-three) receive journeyman's minimum wage," was too arbitrary altogether. This matter must be well known to the union—that young men do not take such an interest in their work in their first years at the trade. It could not be expected that an apprentice should be worth only 1s. per day less than an experienced tradesman. He thought that this matter should be left to the discretion of the employer to say that he could afford to pay him a certain wage. With regard to the overtime, he pointed out that it was not in the interests of the employer to work overtime. He considered that the rule existing, 25 per cent. and 50 per cent., was a fair and just one. Some of his employes were very glad to work overtime so as to get extra-time pay. Work was very spasmodic here, and the employers could not comply with the conditions asked for and keep their machinery going. With regard to apprentices, he considered that the union were taking the wrong view altogether with regard to apprentices being employed debarring journeymen. He said that if they could employ journeymen they could employ apprentices. With regard to the outwork allowance, it had been the custom to pay the time lost in travelling one way, and he did not see any necessity why the extra 1s. per day should be paid. The union demanded 1s. extra when a man went outside three miles from the Christchurch Post-office. With regard to dirt-money, he thought that in some cases it should be paid; it was well earned on marine work. The only other demand made by the union was about the union men having the preference of employment. He never asked his men whether they were unionists or not, as long as they were competent workmen. He said he should like to bring two of the foremen from his firm to give their opinion on apprentices and number of apprentices employed.

In answer to Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Anderson said that he was paying his head blacksmith 13s. per day. There were plenty of men who were not worth the minimum wage. His fitters received 10s. per day, but they could not get good fitters at the present time.

For the union, Mr. Fraser said that he did not consider that range-makers should receive the minimum wage. What the union term a fitter is a man that will take a class of machinery, fix it together, and erect it.

Mr. Troup said he admitted that he had men who he was willing should come under the ruling of the union.

It was then decided for Messrs. Troup and Fraser to go into and endeavour to come to an amicable arrangement as to what men should come under the statement.

Mr. Fraser (for the union) then stated that there were thirty-five members of the union employed at the Government workshops, Addington. There were fifty-seven adults in the engineering trade in Christchurch. He said that any man working at the trade in Auckland received 10s. per day. In the Canterbury District, excluding all other large towns, there were nine under twenty years of age receiving the average wage of 5s. 6d. per week to £1 5s., and twelve over twenty receiving £2 8s. 2d. per week. In the Southland District there were two under nineteen who received 5s., three under twenty receiving £3 per week. In Wellington City there were seventy-nine under twenty averaging from 7s. to £1 3s.; over twenty, there were 113 averaging £2 10s. In Christchurch, turners received £2 8s. 3d., and fitters £2 8s. 3d. The average that is struck in Auckland is £2 2s. There are ten from sixteen to twenty years of age in Napier, and their average wages are from 8s. to £1 1s. There are thirty-four adults, and their average wage is £2 16s. 9d. He found that in Messrs. Scott Brothers' there were nine apprentices; also three fitters, at 9s. per day; two turners, at 9s. per day; two pattern-makers, at 9s. per day; two blacksmiths, at 6s. per day; and one brass-finisher, at 10s. per day: making ten journeymen and nine apprentices.

Mr. Scott considered that five years was a very fair term for an apprenticeship.

In answer to Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Fraser stated that they had not mentioned apprentices' wages in their statement because they left it as a matter that would be best fixed between parents and employers.

The Board then proceeded with evidence in the agricultural-implement trade.

The employers were represented by Messrs. G. Booth, A. W. Beaven, P. Duncan, J. Bain (Reid and Gray), and R. Tomline.

There was argument as to whether Messrs. Morrow, Bassett, and Co. should be included, the firm holding that their men were on the same footing as those of the Walter A. Wood Company, and were not skilled men. The Board decided to exclude them.

Representing the union, Mr. Fraser said that there were four firms that were on the same footing—viz., Messrs. Booth, MacDonald, and Co., Reid and Gray, P. and D. Duncan, Andrews and Beaven, and R. Tomline.

Mr. Fraser agreed to all these cases being taken together.

Mr. Booth pointed out that there was no union amongst the employes in the agricultural-implement trade, as required by the Act, to bring a dispute before the Board. He said that all the