

14. All over the Dominion?—Yes, all over the Dominion—not especially in Auckland; and since then Auckland has on various occasions urged the formation of one union of seamen.

15. The formation of one union with different branches?—Of course. If we had the one union there would be the one executive, and there would be the one fund for the union.

16. There appears to be two different proposals. First there is the proposal for a Dominion award, and then there is the proposal for a Dominion union. It is not proposed to have a Dominion award without a Dominion union?—No.

17. It is not chiefly the matter of the Dominion award?—No; we mostly want the union.

18. Supposing you had a Dominion union: that would mean that all the power would be concentrated in Wellington?—No; the governing body would be an executive council consisting of representatives of each branch, including Auckland, and there you have equal powers.

19. Supposing industrial trouble arises, would that body be able to deal with it?—It would always be glad to do what it could. We are always glad now to do what we can to avoid industrial trouble, and would be glad to do so in the future.

20. But if you give so much power to the executive they might order a strike, whereas now, when they are separate, the Auckland people might, for instance, not agree to strike?—Yes. Well, I do not think that would make very much difference, if any. It is true that the executive may have the power to declare this, that, and the next thing, but at the present moment we have equal powers.

21. For instance, to order racehorses not to be carried?—Our executive did not discuss racehorses.

22. Then, who sent the order?—I do not know.

23. Your executive did not?—No. I say that the matter of racehorses was not considered by the Seamen's Union or by the executive.

24. Under whose instructions were the seamen acting, then?—I am afraid I am unable to say. It seems to me that if we had one union we would be more able to avoid industrial trouble. I can tell you what our executive did do: When the miners wanted to stop bunker coal for the transports during the war our executive prevented it.

25. You have expressed an opinion that amalgamation should be made with the seamen in Australia?—I only just suggested that. I am not putting that forward now.

26. Not now, but this is the first step?—Not necessarily so at all. The position is that at the present time Australian seamen leave ships in this country and transfer to our books of the union. They sail on this coast for a month or two, and then go back to Australia and transfer back again. If there was only one union of seamen in Australasia all that would be altered.

27. Is there one union in the Commonwealth, or is there a union for each State?—They are on exactly the same basis over there at present as we are here, with this difference: that what we call an industrial union here is deemed a branch in Australia. There is a branch in Brisbane, another one in Sydney, one in Melbourne, one in Port Adelaide, and I believe it has been decided to establish one in Newcastle and one in Fremantle. These branches make up the Federated Seamen's Union of Australia, and the executive represents all the branches. We have not got that here. The association is quite valueless to us, and, as far as I can see, wholly valueless to any of the other unions. I think it would be much better for everybody concerned to have one union. My opinion is that the whole of this arbitration legislation wants revising. The constitution of the Arbitration Court itself is not satisfactory.

28. Do you agree with the suggestion of one big union?—If the one big union proposes to take in all the men of all the industries into one union, then I do not support it, because it would not work. It would collapse: it would be too cumbersome: It could not be worked.

29. As far as you are concerned you want to keep your own union to yourself?—We want to mind our own little business as far as we possibly can.

30. But at present you are affiliated to the transport workers?—Well, we cannot very well avoid that; and it is quite possible that if there had been such an organization in existence in 1913 the strike which occurred in 1913 would not have taken place.

31. Supposing you were affiliated with Australia: would that mean that if there was a strike in any part of Australia you would be dragged into it?—Not necessarily so. If we had, say, an Australasian union we would have an Australasian executive council, and New Zealand would of course be represented on that council. I think, myself, that some strike measure would have to be taken to safeguard that position. We might have been involved a little while ago in the Australian strike, perhaps. Strong efforts were made here to involve us, and we had to use a terrible lot of reason to resist it. That was last year.

32. If you are amalgamated with them it would be worse?—Oh, no, not at all. We mostly want the union in order to benefit the seamen's occupation, not to create strikes. We are looking for peace, not strikes.

33. *Mr. Howard.*] There seems to be a general idea that the formation of one union is in order to create trouble. With your long experience of the labour movement do you not think that such a union would stand by the spirit of the Act: that is to say, it would do all it could to prevent industrial trouble rather than create it?—Yes, I believe that is a fundamental point in connection with the whole business. At the present time, for instance, the waterside workers, say, at the Bluff, might get into some trouble, and strike without consulting anybody else. The first thing you know is that there is a strike, and then the flame flashes right up the coast, and the whole of the waterside workers are on strike before you know where you are. With a national organization that could not take place.

34. The one union would not allow a strike to take place until that one union had decided upon it?—Exactly. The same thing took place in 1913. A little bit of a "picaninny" union caused a national strike through the medium of sympathy.

35. A large number of people seem to believe that this Act might be used for the purposes of what is known as the "one big union": do you believe that that is so?—I do not believe that the one big union would be workable.

36. *Mr. S. G. Smith.*] I would like to ask Mr. Young whether he considers it would be a good thing to give the Conciliation Commissioner a vote. Is that wish general?—I could not answer that question one way or the other, but I do not think it has ever been considered by labour generally.