

whom got out at the end of the penny sections, while through passengers have had to wait in Queen Street; and it is the same with workers' cars. I think this provision should be made applicable to the whole of the Dominion. I also support the other proposed amendment with regard to carrying the wires. In conclusion, I have to thank you, Mr Chairman and gentlemen, for your patient hearing and treatment of both the representatives of the union and myself during this inquiry. We appeal to the Committee as men who have been chosen by the electors to represent all classes of the community in the highest Court in the land, and I submit that in approaching this question you will do so with the interests of the public safety uppermost in your minds. As labour men we recognize no party in this business, and we believe that you gentlemen are actuated by the highest sense of responsibility in your position here to-day, and, that being so, we trust that you will assist the Minister in placing before Parliament such a Bill as will be in the best interest of the community at large. Electric traction is only in its infancy. We have electric tramway systems in Auckland, Wellington, Wanganui, Christchurch, and Dunedin. In Invercargill the system is now being pushed on actively, and will soon be in operation, and in New Plymouth they have decided to go in for electric traction. When I was in Hastings lately I saw there an advance agent who was endeavouring to treat with the Napier people for a tramway. There is all the more necessity for this Bill when you contemplate the number of other systems that will be started. I ask you to consider the Bill from that standpoint, not from what it will cost the companies and the Corporations. We have been told it will cost £6,000 to carry out the provisions of this Bill, and a witness was asked by Mr O'Shea, with his guilelessness, where the money was to come from, and the witness properly said he did not care—"if it was right, it should be carried out." It was shown that the profits of the Auckland tramways were £40,000, and that £3,900 has been paid to the Corporation as their share of the profits. Mr Stuart Richardson has placed comparisons before the public from time to time, and has shown conclusively that if the Wellington tramway accounts had been kept in the same way as the Auckland accounts, the results would have been better than those of Auckland. Well, gentlemen, I have finished, and I have to thank you for your courtesy. I desire to state that we, in coming here to advocate this Bill, came, at very great expense to ourselves, to fight for a principle, and our opponents have come here, also at expense, to oppose it on behalf of the profits and expenditure of the systems. I am instructed to lay before this Committee the fact that this will cost us a large amount of money, and to ask that you will consider whether the unions, in advocating the Bill and paying their own expenses, are not actuated by a higher sense of duty than our opponents, who have come here to oppose it on behalf of their expenditure.

(No. 6.)

Mr O'Shea: In reference to these proceedings, gentlemen, I wish, on behalf of the Wellington City Council and the Dunedin City Council, to thank Mr Arnold personally for the impartial manner in which he has conducted this inquiry, and I also wish to thank him for the untiring energy and attention he has shown, as Chairman of the Committee, in attending to all matters that were brought forward in reference to the Bill. I further desire to thank the other members of the Committee for their attendance at the meetings and their attention to the evidence brought forward.

The Chairman: I have to thank you, gentlemen, on behalf of the Committee, for your kind remarks and the great assistance that you have been to us during the consideration of this Bill. The Committee has sat on eighteen days, has held twenty-three meetings, which have occupied in the aggregate fifty-seven and a half hours, and we have heard no less than thirty-six witnesses, in addition to addresses of counsel. It will be necessary now to hold the matter over until the evidence is printed, which I will push on with all possible speed, so that the Bill may be considered by Parliament this session. When deliberating on the measure, the Committee will give due consideration to your representations.

(No. 7.)

NEW ZEALAND EMPLOYERS' FEDERATION.—THE TRAMWAYS BILL.—OBJECTIONS BY THE EMPLOYERS' ASSOCIATION

The following letter has been sent to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Labour :—
"SIR,—

"Wellington, 24th August, 1910
"I am directed by my Parliamentary Committee to convey to you the strong objection of the New Zealand Employers' Federation to section 6 of the Tramways Bill.

"The principle of compelling employers to give the right of appeal in dismissals, disratings, fines, or other punishments would, if generally applied, be subversive of discipline, tend to take the real control of business out of the hands of employers, and would lead to constant friction, as well as being open to abuse.

"I have to point out that Government itself realizes the difficulties which may arise in this connection, as in connection with the Railways Appeal Board the right of veto is secured by the Minister, and has on more than one occasion been exercised by him.

"My committee fears that if the clause referred to becomes law it will be the thin end of the wedge to compel employers of labour to give reasons in every case when it is necessary to discharge employees. It is therefore urged by my federation that the Government should take steps to delete the clause from the Bill.

"I am, &c.,

"WILLIAM PRYOR,

"Secretary, New Zealand Employers' Federation."

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given; printing (1,500 copies) £130.

By Authority : JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1910.

Price 4s. 3d.]