99 H.—35.

be made ?—My answer is: It was quite unnecessary for me to refer to the Conciliation Board, because the point I desired to make depended on the reasons given by Mr. Justice Sim for not making an award. The reasons rather than the fact were relevant to my argument.

8. Do not Mr. Polson's arguments in favour of third-party representation when the worker is bargaining for the sale of his labour apply equally to the worker's claim for representation when the farmer is selling the result of the worker's labour, and also when the farmer is buying or selling a farm?—My answer is: No; because in the case of labour the price is fixed by legal enactment of the Court, and in the case of the farmer he has to sell his product in an open market. This answers also Mr. Roberts's question.

9. In reference to Mr. Polson's statement that every section has had its standard of living cut down, I ask him if he is aware that the average wealth of the community according to the Year-book for last year has increased by 40 per cent. after allowing for the increase in prices?—My answer is: I did not intend to convey the impression that the standard of living of the people of New Zealand as a whole had been cut down. The whole of my argument was designed to show that the farmer's standard had been unfairly reduced as compared with that of those engaged in sheltered industries.

10. I ask him it he considers £4 0s. 8d. a week a fair standard of living for the worker?—My answer is: There was no reference in my paper to the amount of wages. I am concerned only with the method of wage-fixation, not with the amount fixed.

11. With reference to the claim that preference to unionists should lapse automatically when the union adopts direct action, does Mr. Polson not think it fair that the fact should be proved before the union is punished?—My answer is: Yes; I would agree that the union should first be convicted of the offence, and that after conviction the penalty should be the loss of preference.

offence, and that after conviction the penalty should be the loss of preference.

12. Would Mr. Polson tell us the exact time of the delay caused by the stoppages in the mines and on the waterfront, and what the stoppages were due to ?—My answer is: The information is given in the Year-books. It would only be a waste of time for me to read it, since any delegate can turn it up for himself.

13. With reference to the question regarding the word "elasticity" as applied to the Dairy Regulations by Mr. Roberts, my answer is that this question can best be dealt with under the dairy section. I am not dealing with that industry.

14. Since when has labour been exempt from national hardship?—My answer is: So far as I am aware, labour represents the only sections of the community whose standard of living is maintained by law quite regardless of their production.

15. Is it the fact that the farmers are prepared to endorse the preference-to-unionist principle so long as it is applied to the other fellow and they are exempt themselves?—My answer is: In my paper I have endorsed the principle of preference with suitable safeguards. I look upon preference as a suitable reward to any union which loyally discharges its responsibilities.

16. If the compulsory arbitration were abolished, how would Mr. Polson suggest that agreements or awards should be enforced and underpaid wages collected from the various employers?—My answer is: This is a most pertinent question. If the decision of the Conference is that the Arbitration Act should be abolished, it will be necessary for the Conference to recommend suitable methods for the protection of the workers.

17. What objection has Mr. Polson to the fact that unions have organized themselves politically?—My answer is: I have no objection to the workers having a political organization, but I think it should be distinct from trade-union organization.

18. What method would Mr. Polson adopt in fixing a physical anti-sweating minimum?—I want to say at once that I have dealt with this question solely on general principles, and I am not prepared at this stage to present a detailed scheme for the application of the principle in practice.

19. Whether Mr. Polson would be in favour of setting up a National Council to deal wholly with certain industries in which very numerous stoppages have occurred in recent years?—My answer is: No; experience of one National Council has not been satisfactory.

20. How long can the standard of living exceed the output ?—The question is already answered

21. Has the inelasticity prevented the boot and clothing trades from increasing their output?— My answer is: The increased output in the trades mentioned is, I am informed, due to the introduction of modern methods and machines.

22. Does not the quotation from the Right Hon. Sidney Webb imply the contrary to what Mr. Polson suggests?—My answer is: It is possible that the interpretation Mr. Bloodworth places upon the quotation is correct.

23. Does Mr. Polson think that the standard of living of the worker should be cut down?—My answer is: Mr. Martin has drawn a wrong inference from the statement. He asked that this should be answered together with Mr. Semple's question. We certainly have no desire to reduce the worker's standard. We sincerely hope that it can be maintained or improved.

24. Would Mr. Polson agree that the trade-unions or any union of employers should possess the same right to have officially recognized representatives to-day as he claims for the Farmers' Union? —Workers and employers already have the right to be legally represented by a union. All that is necessary is that the workers or employers in any industry shall register an industrial union under the Arbitration Act, and that union at once becomes their legal representative.

25. To what extent can the workers, apart from having a voice in the management of an industry, be held responsible for a low rate of production?—My answer is: They must be held responsible for any restrictions imposed by themselves upon efficient production, such as, for instance, insisting upon the employment of unnecessary men on a job, the division of work into watertight compartments, or other similar restraints.